| VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION C | OF JOEL A. GRATZ 1/30/2012 | |
|--|--|--|
| | 1 <u>I</u> <u>N</u> <u>D</u> <u>E</u> <u>X</u> | |
| | 2 Witness Pages | |
| UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT | 3 JOEL A. GRATZ | |
| EASTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN | 4 Examination by Ms. Lazar 7 | |
| ALVIN BALDUS, CINDY BARBERA, | 5 Examination by Mr. Kelly 57 | |
| CARLENE BECHEN, RONALD BIENDSEIL, RON BOONE, VERA BOONE, ELVIRA BUMPUS, EVANJELINA CLEEREMAN, SHEILA COCHRAN, | 6 | |
| LESLIE W. DAVIS III, BRETT ECKSTEIN, MAXINE HOUGH, CLARENCE JOHNSON, | 7 | |
| RICHARD KRESBACH, RICHARD LANGE, GLADYS MANZANET, ROCHELLE MOORE, | 8 | |
| AMY RISSEEUW, JUDY ROBSON, GLORIA ROGERS, JEANNE SANCHEZ-BELL, CECELIA SCHLIEPP, | | |
| and TRAVIS THYSSEN, | | |
| Plaintiffs, | 10 No. Description Identified | |
| TAMMY BALDWIN, GWENDOLYNNE MOORE, and RONALD KIND, | 11 1026 Deposition notice and subpoena 8 | |
| Intervenor-Plaintiffs, | 12 1027 Response to subpoena in CD form 9 | |
| v. File No. 11-CV-562 | 13 1028 PowerPoint Redistricting Overview 57 | |
| Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in | 14 1029 Memo to Representative Peter Barca 76 | |
| his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, | 15 1030 Discussion points 79 | |
| GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, | 16 1031 Memo to Scott Adrian 85 | |
| [Caption Continued] | 17 1032 Packet of e-mails 91 | |
| VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION | 18 | |
| <u>JOEL A. GRATZ</u> | | |
| Madison, Wisconsin January 30, 2012 | 19 | |
| Brandé A. Browne, RPR, CRR Registered Professional Reporter | (The original exhibits were attached to the original transcript and copies were provided to counsel) | |
| Registered in Oressional Reporter | 21 | |
| | 22 | |
| | 23 | |
| | 24 | |
| | (The original deposition transcript was filed with 25 Attorney Maria S. Lazar) | |
| | | |
| | 3 | |
| and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin | 3 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, | |
| and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, V. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. 16 | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. 16 17 APPEARANCES | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. 16 17 APPEBARANCES | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. 16 17 APPEARANCES | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. 16 17 APPEARANCES 18 19 WENDY K. ARENDS, Attorney, for GODFREY & KAHN, S.C., Attorneys at Law, One East Main Street, Suite 500, Madison, Wisconsin 53703, appearing on behalf of | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants. | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. 16 17 APPEARANCES 18 19 WENDY K. ARENDS, Attorney, for GODFREY & KAHN, S.C., Attorneys at Law, One East Main Street, Suite 500, Madison, | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants. | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. 16 17 APPEARANCES 18 19 WENDY K. ARENDS, Attorney, for GODFREY & KAHN, S.C., Attorneys at Law, One East Main Street, Suite 500, Madison, Wisconsin 53703, appearing on behalf of | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants. | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. 16 17 APPEARAN CES 18 19 WENDY K. ARENDS, Attorney, for GODFREY & KAHN, S.C., Attorneys at Law, One East Main Street, Suite 500, Madison, Wisconsin 53703, appearing on behalf of Plaintiffs Alvin Baldus, et al. | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants. | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. 16 17 APPEARANCES 18 19 WENDY K. ARENDS, Attorney, for GODFREY & KAHN, S.C., Attorneys at Law, One East Main Street, Suite 500, Madison, Wisconsin 53703, appearing on behalf of Plaintiffs Alvin Baldus, et al. 22 PETER G. EARLE, Attorney, for LAW OFFICE OF PETER EARLE, LLC, Attorneys at Law, | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants. | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. 16 17 APPEARANCES 18 19 WENDY K. ARENDS, Attorney, for GODFREY & KAHN, S.C., Attorneys at Law, 20 One East Main Street, Suite 500, Madison, Wisconsin 53703, appearing on behalf of Plaintiffs Alvin Baldus, et al. 22 PETER G. EARLE, Attorney, for LAW OFFICE OF PETER EARLE, LLC, Attorneys at Law, 839 North Jefferson Street, Suite 300, | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants. | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. 16 17 APPEARANCES 18 19 WENDY K. ARENDS, Attorney, for GODFREY & KAHN, S.C., Attorneys at Law, One East Main Street, Suite 500, Madison, Wisconsin 53703, appearing on behalf of Plaintiffs Alvin Baldus, et al. 22 PETER G. EARLE, Attorney, for LAW OFFICE OF PETER EARLE, LLC, Attorneys at Law, | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants. | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. 16 17 APPEAARANCES 18 19 WENDY K. ARENDS, Attorney, for GODFREY & KAHN, S.C., Attorneys at Law, One East Main Street, Suite 500, Madison, Wisconsin 53703, appearing on behalf of Plaintiffs Alvin Baldus, et al. 22 PETER G. EARLE, Attorney, for LAW OFFICE OF PETER EARLE, LLC, Attorneys at Law, 839 North Jefferson Street, Suite 300, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, appearing | |
| General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants, F. JAMES SENSENBRENNER, JR., THOMAS E. PETRI, PAUL D. RYAN, JR., REID J. RIBBLE, and SEAN P. DUFFY, Intervenor-Defendants. VOCES DE LA FRONTERA, INC., RAMIRO VARA, OLGA WARA, JOSE PEREZ, and ERICA RAMIREZ, Plaintiffs, v. Case No. 11-CV-1011 JPS-DPW-RMD Members of the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, each only in his official capacity: MICHAEL BRENNAN, DAVID DEININGER, GERALD NICHOL, THOMAS CANE, THOMAS BARLAND, and TIMOTHY VOCKE, and KEVIN KENNEDY, Director and General Counsel for the Wisconsin Government Accountability Board, Defendants. | 1 VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION of JOEL A. GRATZ, 2 a witness of lawful age, taken on behalf of the 3 Plaintiffs, wherein Alvin Baldus, et al., are 4 Plaintiffs, and Members of the Wisconsin Government 5 Accountability Board, et al., are Defendants, pending 6 in the United States District Court for the 7 Eastern District of Wisconsin, pursuant to subpoena 8 and notice, before Brandé A. Browne, a Registered 9 Professional Reporter and Notary Public in and for 10 the State of Wisconsin, at the offices of 11 Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law, 12 22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, City of Madison, 13 County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, on the 30th 14 day of January 2012, commencing at 9:11 in the 15 forenoon. 16 17 APPEARANCES 18 19 WENDY K. ARENDS, Attorney, for GODFREY & KAHN, S.C., Attorneys at Law, 20 One East Main Street, Suite 500, Madison, Wisconsin 53703, appearing on behalf of Plaintiffs Alvin Baldus, et al. 22 PETER G. EARLE, Attorney, for LAW OFFICE OF PETER EARLE, LLC, Attorneys at Law, 839 North Jefferson Street, Suite 300, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202, appearing telephonically on behalf of Plaintiffs | |

```
A P P E A R A N C E S (Continued)
                                                               1
                                                                          Mr. Gratz
                                                               2
 2
    MARIA S. LAZAR, Assistant Attorney General,
                                                               3
                                                                                   JOEL A. GRATZ,
    for STATE OF WISCONSIN DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE,
                                                               4
                                                                         called as a witness, being first duly sworn,
           17 West Main Street, Madison, Wisconsin 53703,
 4
           appearing on behalf of the Defendants.
                                                               5
                                                                          testified on oath as follows:
 5
                                                               7
    DANIEL KELLY, Attorney,
                                                                                     EXAMINATION
 6
    for REINHART BOERNER VAN DEUREN S.C.,
                                                               8
                                                                  By Ms. Lazar:
           Attorneys at Law, 1000 North Water Street,
 7
           Suite 2100, Milwaukee, Wisconsin 53202,
                                                                  Q Good morning, Mr. Gratz. Have you given a
           appearing on behalf of the Defendants.
                                                              10
                                                                     deposition before?
 8
                                                              11
                                                                  A No.
 9
    Also present: Todd S. Campbell, CLVS
                                                              12
                                                                  Q Okay. And I'm going to give you a few basic
                   Campbell Legal Video Company
                                                              13
                                                                     ground rules; they're very simple. First of all,
10
                    417 Heather Lane, Suite B
                   Fredonia, WI 53021
                                                              14
                                                                     when I ask you a question, you have to answer with
11
                    (262) 447-2199
                                                              15
                                                                     a yes or no because the court reporter can't take
12
                                                              16
                                                                     an uh-huh or a nod; so do you understand that?
                                                              17
                                                                  A Yes.
13
                (Exhibit Nos. 1026 and 1027 marked for
14
                 identification)
                                                              18
                                                                  Q Okay. Next, if I ask you a question that you
15
                                                              19
                                                                     don't understand, ask me to clarify it or ask for
16
                    THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are on the
17
            record. Seated before you is Mr. Joel Gratz.
                                                              20
                                                                     an explanation. If you don't do that, I'm going
18
            This is Video No. 1 of his video deposition,
                                                              21
                                                                     to assume you understand my question when you
19
            taken pursuant to notice and subpoena at the
20
                                                              22
            instance of defendants in the matter of
                                                                     answer it; is that acceptable?
21
            Alvin Baldus, et al. versus Members of the
                                                              23
22
            Wisconsin Government Accountability Board,
23
                                                              24
                                                                  Q If at any point in time you need to take a break,
            et al. This matter is pending in the
24
            United States District Court, Eastern
                                                              25
                                                                      just let me know. If you need a glass of water,
25
            District for the State of Wisconsin,
                                                                                          7
1
            Case No. 11-CV-562. This deposition is
                                                               1
                                                                     coffee, whatever, just let me know. Starting with
 2
                                                               2
            taking place at the law offices of
                                                                     that, Mr. Gratz, you're here pursuant to a
 3
                                                               3
                                                                     deposition notice and subpoena; is that correct?
            Reinhart Boerner & Van Deuren,
 4
            22 East Mifflin Street in Madison, Wisconsin.
                                                                 A Yes.
            The date is Monday, January 30th, 2012, and
                                                                  Q And I'm going to show you what has been marked as
 6
                                                               6
            the time is 9:11 a.m. I am Todd Campbell,
                                                                     Exhibit 1026; do you recognize that document?
 7
            videographer with Campbell Legal Video
                                                                  A Yes, I do.
 8
                                                                  Q And that is the deposition notice and subpoena?
            Company. The court reporter is Brandé Browne
 q
                                                               9
            with For the Record Reporting. Would counsel
                                                                  A Yes, that's correct.
10
                                                              {f 10} {f Q} And if you turn to the second last page, there's
            please introduce themselves, first starting
11
            with the plaintiff.
                                                              11
                                                                     an Exhibit A. Did you review that Exhibit A with
12
                                                              12
                    MS. ARENDS: Wendy Arends,
                                                                     your counsel?
13
                                                              13
            Godfrey & Kahn for the plaintiff.
                                                                  A Yes, I did.
14
                                                              14
                                                                  Q And did you produce any documents pursuant to that
                    MR. EARLE: Peter Earle,
15
                                                              15
            The Law Office of Peter Earle for the Voces
                                                                     Exhibit A?
16
            plaintiffs.
                                                              16
                                                                  A Yes.
17
                    MS. LAZAR: Assistant Attorney
                                                              17 Q And in that regard, I'm going to show you what has
18
                                                              18
            General Maria Lazar for Members of the
                                                                     been marked as Exhibit 1026 and that's a CD, and
19
                                                              19
                                                                      what is on that CD?
            Wisconsin Government Accountability Board,
20
                                                              20 A This CD generally includes things that are
            their director, and general counsel in their
21
                                                              21
            official capacity, together with --
                                                                     responsive to the items listed here in regards to
22
                                                              22
                    MR. KELLY: Daniel Kelly for
                                                                     redistricting.
23
                                                              23 Q And what would that be?
            Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren.
24
                    THE VIDEOGRAPHER: Thank you.
                                                              24
                                                                  A There would be on here some e-mail communication
25
                                                              25
                                                                     between myself and staff people in the
            Would the court reporter please swear in
```

1 There would be files on here that Q So the client is Godfrey & Kahn? 2 2 A Correct. would be related to drawing redistricting maps, 3 including some draft maps by various entities. Q So your client is not any democratic legislature, 4 There would be some documents that would be it's Godfrey & Kahn? 5 5 analysis of maps that were introduced into the A Correct. 6 legislature. I believe that generally covers MS. ARENDS: Well, the client is 7 7 the plaintiffs, so -- he has been retained as what's on here. 8 Q Okay. And I didn't ask for the record, but 8 a litigation consultant for Godfrey & Kahn. Exhibit 1027 is your response to the subpoena? 9 Q Okay. Now, in the documents you provided, you 10 A Yes, that's correct. 10 indicated there were e-mails between you and staff 11 11 Q Is there anything that you have not produced that people in the legislature. I'm -- apologize that 12 12 you're holding back on privilege grounds or any I'm asking you to do this without looking at it. 13 13 other grounds in response to the subpoena? Can you give me a general idea of who all you 14 14 A Yes. communicated with by e-mail? 15 15 Q And what is a general list of those items? A I don't know that this will be completely 16 16 inclusive, but generally it would have been -- the A Generally, there are e-mail communications between 17 17 myself and the Godfrey & Kahn law firm and their e-mail communications would include Scott Adrian. 18 18 employees. Q And who is Scott Adrian? 19 19 Q And is that -- that's the only category of A At the time I was communicating with him, he would 20 documents you haven't produced? 20 have been a staff person for Mike -- a 21 21 representative for Mike Sheridan. Rich Judge, who A And then I guess along with that would be some --22 22 a few handwritten notes that were also related was a staff person previously for 23 23 Representative Sheridan and currently 24 24 MS. ARENDS: Actually, if I could Representative Barca. Jamie Kuhn, a staff person 25 25 interject, those were actually -- we did for Senator Mark Miller, and Mike Browne, a staff 11 1 1 person also for Senator Mark Miller. produce the responsive handwritten notes. 2 Q Okay. So what you haven't produced pursuant to 2 Q And what approximate -- you were retained by 3 privilege are e-mails between yourself and 3 Godfrey & Kahn in early summer of 2011. Do these attorneys or staff at Godfrey & Kahn? e-mails precede that retention date? A Correct. A Correct. 6 Q Okay. We'll get back to those documents in a $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{Q}}$ Okay. Are there any other e-mails that you can 6 7 second. What is your relationship with think of that you would have directed to any other Godfrey & Kahn? When were you retained? staff of the legislature? q A I was retained approximately early summertime of A Not that I can recall. 10 10 2011. Q So basically, you contacted staff persons for 11 Q And what were you retained to do? 11 Representative Sheridan, Barca, and 12 A I was retained by them to provide -- well, to Senator Miller? 13 13 A Correct. review redistricting proposals that were 14 14 Q All right. You also indicated that you had introduced or passed by the legislature and 15 several files with drawing of maps. What do you 15 provide assistance to experts in preparing 16 analysis of those maps. 16 mean by that? 17 17 A These would be files that are in the form that the Q Is there a retainer letter that describes your 18 18 duties? redistricting software used by the legislature, 19 A Yes. 19 Autobound, creates and --20 20 Q And do you have a copy of that? Q Excuse me, I'm sorry. I apologize. Did you have 21 21 A No, I do not believe so. a copy of Autobound? 22 22 A I used the legislature's copy of Autobound. Q And who exactly was your client in that retainer 23 23 Q Okay, continue. 24 MS. ARENDS: Objection, he already 24 A The maps that would be on there would be maps that 25 25 stated who the client was, I mean. were introduced into the legislature. The

```
1
       original map that was introduced as well as -- I
                                                                Q And is that the same map?
 2
       believe there was at least one amended map that
                                                             2 A I have not reviewed them to know.
 3
       was introduced as legislation.
                                                                Q Okay. You also indicated you had an incomplete
 4
    Q Now, what you're talking about is the maps that
                                                                   map you had done by yourself?
 5
       were eventually introduced as Act 43?
                                                               A Correct.
 6
    A Correct.
                                                                Q State or congressional boundaries?
7
    Q Okay. And the amendment to Act 43?
                                                                A State Assembly boundaries.
 8
    A Correct.
                                                                Q Just State Assembly boundaries, not Senate?
 9
                    MR. EARLE: Excuse me, Maria?
                                                                A Well, by the nature of the three Assembly
10
                                                            10
                    MS. LAZAR: Yeah.
                                                                   districts to one Senate district, you could infer
11
                                                            11
                    MR. EARLE: Did you inadvertently
                                                                   Senate districts.
12
                                                            12
           clip his answer? Was his answer complete?
                                                                Q And what was incomplete about that map?
13
                                                            13
                    MS. LAZAR: No, he's still
                                                                A The, I guess, completion is in the eye of the
14
                                                            14
           continuing his answer.
                                                                   beholder to some extent in map drawing. But I
15
                    MR. EARLE: Could you, just for the
                                                            15
                                                                   would say generally, it did not, as I recall, it
16
                                                            16
                                                                   has been some time since I looked at it, get
           sake of me on the phone, refrain from
17
                                                            17
           clipping his answers and allow him to
                                                                   population deviations to an acceptable level in
                                                                   all districts. It may not have, you know,
18
                                                            18
           complete his answers and reserve your
19
                                                            19
           observation until he does complete it?
                                                                   minimized some of the municipal splits. It just
20
                    MS. LAZAR: I will try to do so,
                                                            20
                                                                   was -- I would say, generally, I did not consider
21
                                                            21
           Peter.
                                                                   a final product.
22
                                                            22
                                                                Q And why did you draw that incomplete map?
                    MR. EARLE: All right. Thank you.
23
                                                            23
                                                                A I drew that map after discussions with Assembly
                    MS. LAZAR: Thank you.
24
                                                            24
    Q Mr. Gratz, you were still continuing on the
                                                                   and Senate staff mentioned earlier to, at their --
25
                                                            25
       drawings of maps, you had indicated it was Act 43
                                                                   you know, after discussions with them, so that if
                                                                                       15
1
       and the amendment?
                                                             1
                                                                   they chose to introduce a map into the legislature
 2
   A Act 43, the amendment, the proposal that
                                                             2
                                                                   as an alternative, one was available.
 3
       eventually became Act 44, the congressional map.
                                                             3
                                                                Q Now, taking a step back, when did you draw that
 4
       There is a map that was drawn by
                                                                   incomplete map?
 5
       Representative Kessler, and then there was a map
                                                             5
                                                                A That would have taken place on the weekend
 6
                                                             6
                                                                   immediately prior -- no, immediately after the map
       that was drawn, an incomplete map, I would say,
 7
       drawn by myself, and I think that concludes the
                                                             7
                                                                   which was eventually adopted was first introduced
       maps that are on that CD.
                                                                   or unveiled, which I believe was on a Friday
 9
    Q Okay. So you said Act 43 and the amendment, which
                                                             9
                                                                   afternoon. I don't know the exact date, but it --
10
                                                            10
       is the legislative boundaries; Act 44,
                                                                   the work took place over that weekend immediately
11
       congressional boundaries. A Kessler map, describe
                                                            11
                                                                   after the map that eventually was adopted.
12
                                                            12
       that, please.
                                                                Q And so that would have been in July of 2011?
13
                                                            13
    A It was a map of Assembly districts, and by the
                                                                A Not -- not having the calendar in front of me to
14
                                                            14
       nature of Assembly districts in Wisconsin, the
                                                                   review the exact date of when that was introduced,
15
       Senate districts as well. I couldn't describe to
                                                            15
                                                                   I would not want to say.
16
       you or otherwise detail what it looks like
                                                            16
                                                                Q Could you say at that time had you been retained
17
                                                            17
       exactly.
                                                                   by Godfrey & Kahn?
18
                                                            18
    Q Was that also a congressional map or just a state
                                                                A Not knowing the -- not having the calendar with
19
       legislative map?
                                                            19
                                                                   those dates in front of me, I could not say for
                                                            20
20
    A Just state legislative.
                                                                   sure. I do not believe so.
21
                                                            21
    Q Are you familiar with any of the pleadings in this
                                                                Q Because I was trying to pinpoint a little bit.
22
                                                            22
       case? And let me explain that a little further.
                                                                   You had said you were retained in -- I think I
23
                                                            23
       Are you familiar with an amicus motion that was
                                                                   believe you stated you were retained in early
       filed that has a map purportedly by Fred Kessler?
                                                            24
                                                                   summer of 2011. Just off the recollection of what
25 A Yes, I am.
                                                            25
                                                                   you have today, do you know if that was before or
```

- VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF JOEL A. GRATZ 1/30/2012 1 after Acts 43 and 44 were introduced to the and preparation of voter lists, mailing lists, 2 2 Senate Assembly? that kind of thing for political campaigns or 3 A I believe I was retained by Godfrey & Kahn after other political organizations. 4 those were introduced. 4 Q How many employees of Forward Strategies? 5 Q I'm not going to hold you to that. We'll get the A There are, including myself, two full-time 6 retainer letter. We'll have exact dates. I'm employees and approximately a half-dozen part-time 7 7 just trying to get a sense if you recalled when employees that work in the call center. 8 that was. At the time that you drew this map, 8 Q And would there be a certain political tilt to were you doing it on behalf of anyone? Did you your clients? 10 10 have a client at that time? A Pretty much all of my clients that are political 11 11 A I was not paid by or hired by anyone. I was tend to be democrats. Although, I have 12 12 mainly doing it as a public service for others who occasionally worked for interest groups that are 13 13 I had worked with in the legislature in the past. probably otherwise affiliated. 14 14 Q Well, let's get into that a little bit. What is Q And do you have any professional degrees? 15 your association with the legislature? 15 A Professional, I graduated from the UW of Madison 16 16 A Formal association? with an undergraduate degree. I'm not sure if you 17 17 Q Formal and then we'll go to informal. meant beyond that. 18 A There is no formal, you know, association or 18 Q And what was your undergraduate degree? 19 employment with the legislature at this time nor 19 A It was in economics. 20 at the time when -- when I would have been working 20 Q And when was that? 21 21 A That was 1995. on that map with them. 22 22 Q And what did you do after you graduated? **Q** Is there an informal association? 23 23 A I would say yes. A Immediately after I graduated or broadly? Q And what would that be? 24 Q Well, we can start, just start listing --25 25 A My first job after college, I spent a year A Again, I have been previously a legislative 19 1 1 employee who worked on redistricting, and you managing a small business, Four Star Video. 2 know, offered my assistance to the legislative 2 3 leadership and staff, you know, from time to time 3 on redistricting. 5 Q Okay. I know we're still going through the 5 6 6 documents that you produced, and I'll make a note 7 to myself about where we sat there. Let's go back 7 8 and do a little background information. What is
- q your professional career? 10 A I would say, broadly, I do political consulting 11 and political campaign work. 12 Q And do you have a company that --13 A I have my own business called Forward Strategies. 14 **Q** And when was that formed?

17 A It's an LLC. 18 Q Thank you. And what does Forward Strategies do? 19 A We do a variety of political work. One aspect of 20 the political work we do is polling for political 21 campaigns. We operate a small call center and 22 conduct public opinion surveys. We're employed by

A It was formed in approximately January of 2003.

Q And what is that corporation, an Inc.?

15

16

23 political campaigns to do so. Also provide consulting services that generally relate to data 25 and technology for political campaigns. The use

After that year, I went to work for the Assembly Democratic Caucus. I worked for that caucus for approximately two and a half years, I believe. At which point I took a job working for the Science Museum of Minnesota in St. Paul. I worked in the Science Museum in their development office for approximately two years, and returned to Madison then to work for the Senate Democratic Caucus in the summer of 2000. I worked for the Senate Democratic Caucus until it -- it was dissolved. I don't remember the exact date of that.

office of -- Office of Policy and Budget, I believe it was called, and worked for that office for a number of -- for probably a year or so, working primarily on redistricting. I then -there was a brief period of time where I took a leave from the State and worked exclusively on campaign work for the Senate Democratic Campaign Committee, as I recall. And then spent a number of years working for State Senator Russ Decker. And then I believe it was in 2005, left Senate employment and State employment entirely to go

There was a subsequent office called the

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF JOEL A. GRATZ 1/30/2012 work full-time for my -- at my business. in the State Senate. And then I also worked with 2 Q Forward Strategies? 2 the -- a plan in 2000 -- after the 2010 census, a 3 A Correct. I would say -- I would conclude by 3 plan was not agreed to by both houses, so there saying in addition to the -- having the business was litigation, and I worked with the attorneys 5 5 Forward Strategies, I also, within the last month providing the analysis they needed and the 6 and a half, took a job or additional work as experts -- providing information the experts 7 7 director of the Assembly Democratic Campaign needed at that time for litigation. 8 Committee. Q And I apologize, you said that was in 2010? Q You started out, you worked for Four Star Video; A No, that was in 2000, or really the work would 10 10 what was that company? have happened in 2001, 2002. 11 11 A What were they? Q Explain that again because I must have missed 12 Q Yes. 12 that, and I apologize. 13 A They were a small business video store. A So I first drew the map that was ultimately passed 14 14 Q Okay. And the were means they no longer are? by the State Senate. That was passed by the 15 A I believe they actually still exist. The 15 Senate, I would have to go back and look and see 16 ownership changed a number of years ago, I know. 16 for the exact date. But the Senate passed a plan. 17 17 Q And what did you do for Four Star Video? The State Assembly passed a different plan, there 18 18 was not agreement. So there was litigation at A I was first the operations and then eventually the 19 19 that time over redistricting in federal court, and general manager. 20 Q Then next you worked for the Assembly Democratic 20 I worked for the law firms that were employed by 21 Caucus for two and a half years? 21 the legislature at that time to provide the 22 A Correct. 22 analysis and data needs for litigation in that 23 23 Q What did you do for the caucus? 24 A I was generally a caucus analyst. My main Q And in that case, you were representing the 25 25 function was to assist legislative offices with democratic legislature? 1 their -- accessing the voter files so those 1 A I was representing the State Senate who were --2 offices could contact their constituents. 2 you know, who had a democratic majority at that 3 3 time. Q Okay. When you were working for the 4 Science Museum, I'll take it you had no Q Okay. You mentioned that you went to redistricting tasks? redistricting conferences in about 2000? 6 A Correct. 6 A Correct. 7 Q Then next you worked for the Senate Democratic Q And what were those? Caucus. Did you -- what did you do for the A I would have attended one or more NCSL, National q democratic caucus? 9 Conference of State Legislature's conferences that 10 10 A Again, a big part of it was similar to the they put on specifically on redistricting, 11 Assembly caucus work, that I was helping the 11 including all aspects from the technology of 12 12 incumbent legislative offices work with the lists redistricting, legal aspects, and so on of 13 13 of their constituents and other kind of data and redistricting. 14 14 technology needs. And that's when I also began --Q You also mentioned that you used the redistricting 15 15 this was during the time leading up to the software. In 2000 was it still the same, 16 16 redistricting, and so I began to familiarize Autobound? 17 17 A It was an earlier version of Autobound, yes. myself with redistricting software, the concepts 18 18 Q Okay. Then you indicated that you -- I think this of redistricting, attending conferences relating 19 to redistricting, and that sort of thing. 19 may have been what you've just been talking about. 20 Q And that would be around the 2000 census?

20 You indicated the office of policy and budget; is

21 that the redistricting work that we're talking

22

about?

23 A Yes, there was -- the Senate caucus existed up 24 until there was a time where there was an

25 agreement to get rid of the caucuses, and a small

21

22

23

24

25

A Correct.

redistricting?

Q And what exactly did you do with regard to

A Ultimately, I drew the maps that were -- that the

Senate leadership introduced and ultimately passed

number of staff were kept on in this office of there are spreadsheets that show, for instance, 2 2 policy and budget. I was one of those people who which legislatures are paired into the same 3 was kept on. So there was kind of a transition or 3 district. That was one thing that immediately 4 downsizing from caucus to policy and budget staff. after the maps were introduced, everyone was 5 Q And it was in the same time frame that you're interested in. There will be maps that show the 6 talking about the redistricting and attending the population -- not maps, spreadsheets that show the 7 7 conferences and doing some analysis and data work? population demographics of the different maps or 8 8 at least some of the maps. I won't say that it's Q Next, you indicated you left the State and did all of the maps. I think it primarily would be 10 10 some work on the Senate Democratic Campaign the map that was actually introduced and 11 11 Committee? ultimately passed. There will be spreadsheets or 12 12 A Correct. PDFs that show the population retention, comparing 13 13 Q Did you do any work regarding redistricting for the old 2001 districts to the proposed 2011 14 14 districts. I believe that's -- I think that's 15 A No, I do not believe so. what covers what the analysis would have. 16 16 Q And that analysis was prepared by you? Q Then you worked for Senator Russ Decker? 17 17 A Correct. A Correct. 18 18 Q Okay. You also mentioned some handwritten notes; Q Any work on redistricting at that time? 19 19 A I worked on legislative matters broadly at that what were those? 20 time. I suspect that we would have talked about 20 A The handwritten notes, I don't recall exactly 21 21 what -- without looking at them, I would not be potential legislation and concepts regarding 22 22 redistricting on a longer time horizon given the able to answer that. 23 23 Q Any handwriting that we'd find on the CD would be time frame when I was working for him. 24 Q And lastly, you mentioned in the last month and a your handwriting? 25 25 A There may be others' handwriting. I would have to half you've now taken the position as director of 27 1 the Assembly Democratic Campaign Committee? 1 look at it again to say for sure. 2 A Correct. 2 Q Okay. You -- you mentioned the map files, the 3 3 Q And what do you do in that position? Act 43 and 44, the Kessler map, and what you A My job is to manage and oversee campaigns for deemed your incomplete map. Do you know if the State Assembly, to try to recruit candidates for Kessler map or your incomplete map were ever 6 Assembly races and provide them guidance and introduced in Wisconsin? 7 instruction on successful campaigns. A As far as I know, no. Q Have you ever been a lobbyist? Q Do you know why they were not? A T have not. A T do not. 10 10 Q Jumping back to the CD that you brought in, you Q Do you know if there was any discussion about 11 mentioned the files, the e-mails, the files with 11 introducing them? 12 drawing maps; you said you had drafts by other 12 A I do not. 13 13 Q Do you know if there was any ban or impediment to entities. What did you mean by that? 14 14 A I think -- well, what I meant was the Fred Kessler introducing them? 15 map that is on here. There is the maps the 15 A I do not. 16 legislative majority republicans drew. I don't 16 Q In your e-mails to Representatives Sheridan, 17 17 know that there's any, as I said, I don't know Barca, and Senator Miller, what were you in 18 18 that there's any other maps on there. general discussing? 19 Q That's what you meant by drafts by other entities? 19 A The e-mails would have been to their staff, not to 20 them directly. 21 21 Q Okay. You also indicated you had documents with Q I apologize, to their staff. What were you 22 22 analysis of the maps introduced? discussing with their staff members? 23 23 A Correct. A I believe the e-mails are generally, you know,

24

25

when can we get together to, you know, look at,

you know -- for me to access their computer to run

Q And what does that consist of?

A There will be, I believe, from my recollection,

25

the analysis, and you know, scheduling of times to Q Okay. But you don't recall being in court in that 2 2 do that. I may have e-mailed them the same case? 3 analysis that otherwise appears on the disk as A Twas not. well, those spreadsheets, the population changes Q And you've never testified at any other trials? 5 and pairings and that sort of thing. Q And you mentioned those spreadsheets regarded Q Have you written any articles or texts on 7 7 Act 43 and 44? redistricting? 8 A Correct. 8 A Ones which were published? Q Did you ever get together with the staff members Q Yes. 10 10 and/or the representatives -- let's strike that. A No. 11 11 Did you ever get together with the staff members? Q Have you written any that were not published? 12 A Yes. A I would have over time written, you know, memos 13 Q And how many times did you do that? regarding redistricting over the course of the 14 14 A I don't have an exact number, I would say. last 10 years or so, but nothing that was 15 Q Would you have done that before or after Act 43 published. 16 16 and 44 were introduced? Q And who did you write those for? 17 A After. 17 A That would have been while I was employed by the 18 Q And what was the purpose of those meetings? 18 legislature, so they would have been for the 19 19 A The purpose of those meetings was to, you know, legislatures I was working for at that time. 20 discuss, you know, whether they wanted a map 20 Q And would you still have copies of those memos? 21 21 drawn -- a draft map drawn to have one available. A I would not. 22 22 ${f Q}$ During the time of about the summer of 2011 to Q And that would be a draft map to counter Act 43 23 and 44? 23 present, I mentioned contact with democratic 24 24 MS. ARENDS: Objection. legislators in the State of Wisconsin. Did you 25 25 MR. EARLE: Objection to the form communicate with any democratic members from the 29 31 1 1 National Democratic Committee regarding of that question. 2 2 A I don't know. I would not want to say whether to redistricting? counter it. I don't know how I could answer that. 3 A Can you restate the time frame? 4 Q Well, let's rephrase. That was a draft of a map Q Sure. The time frame would be from about the that would have been different than Act 43 and 44? summer of 2011 when Act 43 and 44 were introduced 6 6 A Correct. through present? 7 Q Did you ever get together with the representatives A I don't believe so, no. and not their staff? Q Did you communicate with any members of the q A Not that I recall. q Democratic National Committee prior to the summer 10 10 Q Did you ever get together with any democratic of 2011 regarding redistricting? 11 representatives or senators? 11 A Democratic National Committee or members of 12 12 A Not that I could recall for certain. Congress? 13 13 Q And I apologize. I should have been limiting this Q We can do both. We'll start with Democratic 14 14 temporally. I'm sure you have gotten together National Committee. 15 with senators and democrats. I'm talking about 15 A I think in either case, the answer is no, I did 16 with regard to redistricting starting in or about 16 not communicate with any Democratic National 17 17 the summer of 2011 going forward? Committee staff people nor members of Congress. 18 18 A Yes, I understand that. Correct. Q And this would be just limited solely to anything 19 Q Okay. Have you ever testified as an expert in any 19 regarding redistricting from the 2010? 20 20 A Correct. 21 21 ${f Q}$ Did you give a presentation in August of 2011 to A I believe during -- I have never testified in 22 22 person, neither given a deposition or appeared in the Wisconsin Association of Lobbyists in 23 court. I believe during the 2001 redistricting, 23 Spring Green, Wisconsin? there were affidavits submitted that I would have 24 A Yes, I did. 25 ${f 25}$ ${f Q}$ And how did you -- how were you asked to present prepared.

VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF JOEL A. GRATZ 1/30/2012 at that association meeting? new districts? 2 A I was invited by one of their members or 2 A It was both. 3 leadership. Q Okay. And how much of your presentation was on Q And what were you invited to do? how you redistrict? 5 A I was invited to come and speak generally about A I -- I don't know how to characterize how much the redistricting process and about what the time. I don't recall exactly how much was process 7 7 new -- can't recall whether they were proposed or versus the outcome. 8 approved maps at that time, what they looked like. 8 Q Did you tell the audience or the attendees that Q And what type of meeting was this? Was this a 9 you felt the democrats could do well under the new 10 10 conference, an all day, a week, a what? 11 11 A I don't know how long the whole thing was. The A I don't recall whether I said or did not say that. 12 part on redistricting was approximately an hour Q Do you recall what you told them regarding how the 13 and a half. 13 democrats would fare under the new maps? 14 14 Q And of that hour and a half, how long was your A I don't recall exactly what I told them at that 15 15 presentation? time regarding that. 16 A 20, 25 minutes maybe. 16 Q When you were drawing your incomplete map for 17 17 redistricting, you used the Autobound software at Q And who else presented during that time? 18 A Representative -- former Representative 18 the legislature's offices? 19 19 Joe Handrick and I believe 20 Attorney Mike Wittenwyler also gave a 20 Q Did you -- so the only terminals you used would 21 21 presentation. have been there? 22 Q Mike Wittenwire? 22 A Correct. 23 A Wittenwyler. 23 Q And where were those terminals located? 24 24 Q And this was a conference that was in A There was one -- there was one terminal I used, 25 25 Spring Green. Do you know how many people which was located in, I believe, what's called 35 1 attended? 1 the -- it's a conference room that's associated 2 A I don't off the top of my head, no. with the Democratic Leadership offices. 3 3 Q When you gave your presentation, your 20, 25 Q But in the Capitol? minutes, was it to a huge conference room? Was it A Correct. to a small conference room like this? Do you have Q And so you used the Democratic Leadership's 6 6 a sense? terminals at the Capitol? 7 A It was in a lounge area. I would -- I would 7 A Correct. broadly range it could have been 25 to 40 people. Q And you were not involved with the purchase of q Q And the people who were attending were whom? q those terminals or anything to do with that, 10 10 A As far as I know, they were all lobbyists. correct? 11 Q Do you have any records or documents regarding 11 A I did not purchase them. I had previously served 12 12 your presentation? on what's called the redistricting staff working 13 13 A There was a PowerPoint, and that PowerPoint may as group the year prior, and there was discussion of 14 14 well be on the CD here. what needs the terminals ought to have, and so I 15 15 MS. ARENDS: And let me just would have been part of the discussion at that 16 interject here for a moment. The PowerPoint 16 time just about what they should purchase. But I 17 17 is on the CD. did not purchase or really directly be involved in 18 18 MS. LAZAR: Okay. the purchasing. 19 Q And what was the purpose of your presentation? 19 Q But you -- from your understanding beforehand is 20 20 A The purpose was to, you know, generally educate that you believe the democratic leadership 21 21 the lobbyists about what the new districts looked purchased those terminals that you used?

of what they meant for democrats.

Q So would you say this was more in line of -- it
wasn't how you redistrict, but what to do with the

23 Technology Service Bureau did the purchasing.

24 Q Okay. When you did your work drawing the maps,
obviously you got materials and data about the

like and also provide a, you know, a perspective

22

A No, I believe that the State Legislative

22

23

25

census and the TIGER files. Where did you get of various, you know, pieces of geography to go 2 2 that information? into one district or another. 3 A That was already on those computers and prepared Q And he would have done some map drawing for your by LTSB, the technology service bureau. map? 5 5 Q Do you know who put that on those computers? A Yes. Q Okay. And he did that map drawing with you at the A It was several members of their staff who work on 7 7 redistricting and GIS matters. terminals in the Capitol? 8 Q Did you have any -- did you have any access to 8 A He did it at the terminal in the Capitol. terminals at The Shop Consulting? Q Did he do any work at his, The Shop Consulting 10 A I did not. 10 location? 11 11 A I don't know one way or the other. Q Have you ever gone to The Shop Consulting? A Can you tell me what time period? Q When you were drawing this map, how long did it 13 Q That would be a good question. Let's start with 14 14 from mid 2011 through present? A Are you asking in terms of hours or days? 15 A No. Q Well, I guess either. 16 Q Have you gone there at any time in 2011? 16 A My recollection is we worked on it over the --17 17 A I doubt it. mainly over the course of the weekend immediately 18 Q And if you had gone there, there was some 18 after the -- the other map was officially 19 19 hesitancy, what would you have gone there for? introduced into the legislature, and maybe for a 20 MR. EARLE: Object to the form of 20 few days after that. So over the course of four 21 21 the question. You're asking him to days, and that's only an estimate. 22 22 speculate. Q And obviously not working all the time during 23 A I would answer that I've never gone to 23 those four days? 24 24 The Shop Consulting relating to redistricting at A Right. And during that time, it's hard for me to 25 25 all. remember exactly how many hours. 37 39 $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{Q}}\,$ Do you know -- explain what The Shop Consulting 1 1 Q And you mentioned before this was just a 2 legislative boundary map, not congressional? 3 A I don't know all of what business they're involved 3 A Correct. in. I have contact with them from time to time Q Who was given copies of your map? because they also do political consulting and A I don't know the answer to that. It resided on 6 6 their machine there. So I don't know who would campaign work. 7 Q So when you drew your maps, you did not use have had access to it. The Shop Consulting? Q Oh, that would have been my next question. q A I did not. q had access to the conference room and the 10 10 Q Who assisted you in drawing your maps? terminals? 11 A There were -- assisted -- some of the 11 MS. ARENDS: Objection. 12 legislative staff people mentioned earlier from 12 A I don't know how. 13 the leadership offices may have been there while I 13 Q When you left those rooms, were they locked? Did 14 was working on the maps. As well, Mike White from 14 you need a passkey to get in? 15 The Shop Consulting also would have been -- been 15 A Yes. 16 16 part of that process at times. Q You mentioned redistricting criteria; what did you 17 17 $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{Q}}\,$ And what assistance did the legislative staff mean by that? 18 18 provide you? A Well, the traditional redistricting criteria are 19 19 A We would have, you know, discussed kind of the -to, you know, minimize population deviations among 20 20 the districts, to create districts that are you know, how the maps were coming, coming along 21 21 in regards to the various redistricting criteria. compact and contiguous, to create districts that 22 22 Q And how did Mike White of The Shop Consulting help recognize communities of interest. Those are the, 23 23 you know, the generally-accepted redistricting

24

25

criteria that all maps try to conform to.

Q Do you know with the map you drew, and it may not

A He would have -- I believe Mike also actually, you

know, did some of the map drawing, the selections

24

25

be, you said it wasn't complete, did you do the Q Regarding redistricting in 2011? 2 districts that were in Milwaukee? A He -- interaction, I would say no. Although, he 3 A I don't recall, you know, which ones I would have 3 was -- he came for a hearing that I was at, that I attended one day, and I believe I said hello to worked on versus anyone else. 5 5 Q Do you recall whether or not you added another African-American district to the districts that Q Did you ever receive any additional proposed maps 7 7 had been identified in Act 43 for Milwaukee? or redistricting data from Congressman Obey in A Without reviewing it again, I don't recall. 8 Q But that would be in your map that's on the CD? A No. 10 10 Q 2012? A Correct. 11 11 Q Do you know, did you have one or two districts for A No. 12 12 Hispanics in the Assembly 8 and 9? Q Have you seen any maps since then that would have 13 13 A I don't recall that one way or the other. been proposed by Congressman Obey? 14 14 A No. Q Do you know what the number of delayed voters or 15 sometimes called disenfranchisement would be for 15 Q How many times have you contacted the Government 16 16 Accountability Board in 2011 regarding your map? 17 17 A I don't recall the exact number. I know that the redistricting? 18 goal was to make it substantially less. 18 A Regarding redistricting? 19 19 Q And did you make it substantially less? Q Yes. 20 A I believe so, but again, without reviewing, I 20 A I don't know that I have ever contacted them 21 21 don't know those exact numbers. regarding redistricting. 22 22 Q How would I find out what your delayed voting Q How many times have you contacted the Government 23 23 Accountability Board then in 2011? number would be? 24 A If -- it may appear in -- you know, there may have 24 A I -- I don't know exactly how many times. I -- by 25 25 been a report that was run that was provided to the nature of my work doing a lot of political 41 43 1 the legislative staff people that would be in the 1 data work, I, you know, not infrequently contact 2 e-mails. I don't recall for sure that it was. If 2 them to purchase or ask questions about voter 3 it was not a number that's in the reports that are 3 registration data, and I also regularly attend there, the Autobound software has a process to their -- their, you know, roughly monthly board compare new districts to old districts, and then meetings. 6 6 Q Okay. Have you requested census and other data once that's done, you need to look at, you know, 7 for each district, you know, the odds and the 7 from the Government Accountability Board for the evens, which people are impacted. 2010 census? 9 Q Is it possible using what you provided in your CD 9 A I don't believe Government Accountability keeps 10 10 that anyone with access to Autobound could figure census data. 11 out the number that were --11 Q Have you requested in or about October or November 12 12 A Absolutely. data from the Government Accountability Board 13 13 Q You mentioned minimum population deviation. Did regarding anything? 14 14 you also address shifting of people for core MS. ARENDS: Objection, this would 15 15 retention from one district to another? have to do with his work as a litigation 16 16 A Yes. consultant. So I would instruct him not to 17 17 **Q** And how many people did you move from one district answer the question. 18 18 to another? Q You're not going to answer whether or not you even 19 A I don't know the number off the top of my head. 19 contacted the Government Accountability Board in 20 20 Q Do you know if that information could be compiled October or November of 2011? 21 21 from your map? MS. ARENDS: I mean, as we all know 22 22 A Yes, it could. from, based on Doug's letter, that yes, he 23 23 Q Did you have any involvement with former contacted the Government Accountability 24 Congressman David Obev? 24 Board. It was in relation to his work that 25 25 MS. ARENDS: Objection. he did as a litigation consultant.

| 1 | VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION O | 1 JOLL / | 1. 010/12 1/00/2012 | | | |
|--|--|--|---|--|--|--|
| 1 | MS. LAZAR: Okay, so | 1 | his interpretation of that letter? | | | |
| 2 | MR. KELLY: I think we need that | 2 | MS. LAZAR: No. I said that there | | | |
| 3 | testimony from Mr. Gratz. | 3 | was a contact in November of 2011, and then | | | |
| 4 | MR. EARLE: I think the objection | 4 | there was an objection. | | | |
| 5 | is it falls outside the scope of Rule 26. | 5 | MR. EARLE: You're making you | | | |
| 6 | MS. LAZAR: Well, the scope of | 6 | got me I think we've got kind of like | | | |
| 7 | Rule 26 allows me to ask Mr. Gratz if he did | 7 | Who's on first situation here. Could you | | | |
| 8 | contact the Government Accountability Board | 8 | rephrase the question so I understand it? | | | |
| 9 | in November of 2011 on behalf of his client. | 9 | MS. LAZAR: Sure. I started with | | | |
| 10 | I'm not asking any more than that at this | 10 | the foundation that there was a letter from | | | |
| 11 | time. So are you still instructing him not | 11 | counsel, Godfrey & Kahn, to our offices | | | |
| 12 | to answer my question? | 12 | indicating that there was communication | | | |
| 13 | MS. ARENDS: That information is | 13 | between Mr. Gratz and the Government | | | |
| 14 | not discoverable. | 14 | Accountability Board in November of 2011. | | | |
| 15 | MS. LAZAR: Whether or not he | 15 | MR. EARLE: That's your | | | |
| 16 | contacted the Government Accountability Board | 16 | representation to the deponent? | | | |
| 17 | on your behalf is not discoverable? | 17 | MS. LAZAR: Yes. | | | |
| 18 | MS. ARENDS: I would say so, yes. | 18 | MR. EARLE: Now, I'm not there, so | | | |
| 19 | MS. LAZAR: So you're instructing | 19 | I don't have the benefit of seeing whether | | | |
| 20 | Mr. Gratz not to answer my question? | 20 | you've marked and shown him an exhibit that | | | |
| 21 | MS. ARENDS: Yes. | 21 | represents fact. | | | |
| 22 | Q When you contact the Government Accountability | 22 | MS. LAZAR: No exhibit. | | | |
| 23 | Board, do you identify we'll just take the year | 23 | MS. ARENDS: There is no exhibit, | | | |
| 24 | of 2011. When you contact the Government | 24 | which is why I objected because this assumes | | | |
| 25 | Accountability Board, do you identify on whose | 25 | that he's aware of the letter, that he has | | | |
| | 45 | | 47 | | | |
| | | | | | | |
| 1 | behalf you are contacting them? | 1 | seen the letter. | | | |
| 1 2 | behalf you are contacting them? A Not typically. | 1 2 | seen the letter. MS. LAZAR: My question is whether | | | |
| _ | | | | | | |
| 2 | A Not typically. | 2 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether | | | |
| 2 | A Not typically.Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, | 2 3 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability | | | |
| 2 3 4 | <pre>A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government</pre> | 2 3 4 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that | 2 3 4 5 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? | 2 3 4 5 6 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a question, Peter. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've asked him whether he did contact the | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a question, Peter. MR. EARLE: Could you I didn't | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've asked him whether he did contact the Government Accountability Board. | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a question, Peter. MR. EARLE: Could you I didn't hear the last word of it. You made a | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've asked him whether he did contact the Government Accountability Board. MR. EARLE: At this point, my | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a question, Peter. MR. EARLE: Could you I didn't hear the last word of it. You made a declaration there was a letter, and then what | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've asked him whether he did contact the Government Accountability Board. MR. EARLE: At this point, my objection would be that you're becoming | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a question, Peter. MR. EARLE: Could you I didn't hear the last word of it. You made a declaration there was a letter, and then what did you ask? | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've asked him whether he did contact the Government Accountability Board. MR. EARLE: At this point, my objection would be that you're becoming argumentive because counsel present in the | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a question, Peter. MR. EARLE: Could you I didn't hear the last word of it. You made a declaration there was a letter, and then what did you ask? MS. LAZAR: Is that correct. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've asked him whether he did contact the Government Accountability Board. MR. EARLE: At this point, my objection would be that you're becoming argumentive because counsel present in the room has instructed the witness not to answer | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a question, Peter. MR. EARLE: Could you I didn't hear the last word of it. You made a declaration there was a letter, and then what did you ask? MS. LAZAR: Is that correct. MR. EARLE: You're asking for an | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've asked him whether he did contact the Government Accountability Board. MR. EARLE: At this point, my objection would be that you're becoming argumentive because counsel present in the room has instructed the witness not to answer that question based on the scope of Rule 26. | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a question, Peter. MR. EARLE: Could you I didn't hear the last word of it. You made a declaration there was a letter, and then what did you ask? MS. LAZAR: Is that correct. MR. EARLE: You're asking for an affirmation of whether counsel sent a letter. | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've asked him whether he did contact the Government Accountability Board. MR. EARLE: At this point, my objection would be that you're becoming argumentive because counsel present in the room has instructed the witness not to answer that question based on the scope of Rule 26. You have a disagreement with counsel over on | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a question, Peter. MR. EARLE: Could you I didn't hear the last word of it. You made a declaration there was a letter, and then what did you ask? MS. LAZAR: Is that correct. MR. EARLE: You're asking for an affirmation of whether counsel sent a letter. MS. LAZAR: No. No, no, no, no, | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've asked him whether he did contact the Government Accountability Board. MR. EARLE: At this point, my objection would be that you're becoming argumentive because counsel present in the room has instructed the witness not to answer that question based on the scope of Rule 26. You have a disagreement with counsel over on the scope of Rule 26. So I don't know that | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a question, Peter. MR. EARLE: Could you I didn't hear the last word of it. You made a declaration there was a letter, and then what did you ask? MS. LAZAR: Is that correct. MR. EARLE: You're asking for an affirmation of whether counsel sent a letter. MS. LAZAR: No. No, n | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've asked him whether he did contact the Government Accountability Board. MR. EARLE: At this point, my objection would be that you're becoming argumentive because counsel present in the room has instructed the witness not to answer that question based on the scope of Rule 26. You have a disagreement with counsel over on the scope of Rule 26. So I don't know that there's much profit at this point in arguing | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a question, Peter. MR. EARLE: Could you I didn't hear the last word of it. You made a declaration there was a letter, and then what did you ask? MS. LAZAR: Is that correct. MR. EARLE: You're asking for an affirmation of whether counsel sent a letter. MS. LAZAR: No. No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no. All right. Let's take a step back. What I said was According to counsel's | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've asked him whether he did contact the Government Accountability Board. MR. EARLE: At this point, my objection would be that you're becoming argumentive because counsel present in the room has instructed the witness not to answer that question based on the scope of Rule 26. You have a disagreement with counsel over on the scope of Rule 26. So I don't know that there's much profit at this point in arguing about that. | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a question, Peter. MR. EARLE: Could you I didn't hear the last word of it. You made a declaration there was a letter, and then what did you ask? MS. LAZAR: Is that correct. MR. EARLE: You're asking for an affirmation of whether counsel sent a letter. MS. LAZAR: No. No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, no. All right. Let's take a step back. What I said was According to counsel's letter, there was a contact to the Government | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've asked him whether he did contact the Government Accountability Board. MR. EARLE: At this point, my objection would be that you're becoming argumentive because counsel present in the room has instructed the witness not to answer that question based on the scope of Rule 26. You have a disagreement with counsel over on the scope of Rule 26. So I don't know that there's much profit at this point in arguing about that. MS. LAZAR: Well, my question then | | | |
| 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A Not typically. Q And pursuant to letters from counsel in this case, there was a communication with the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011; is that correct? MS. ARENDS: Objection. MR. EARLE: I'm sorry, was that a question? MS. LAZAR: Yes, that was a question, Peter. MR. EARLE: Could you I didn't hear the last word of it. You made a declaration there was a letter, and then what did you ask? MS. LAZAR: Is that correct. MR. EARLE: You're asking for an affirmation of whether counsel sent a letter. MS. LAZAR: No. No, no, no, no, no, no, no, no, all right. Let's take a step back. What I said was According to counsel's letter, there was a contact to the Government Accountability Board in November of 2011, is | 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | MS. LAZAR: My question is whether or not Mr. Gratz contacted the accountability board in Government Accountability Board in November of 2011. That information would not be privileged information. Whether or not there is a contact is something that this witness can testify to. I have not asked him what he asked for, on whose behalf he did it, or whether he got the information. I've asked him whether he did contact the Government Accountability Board. MR. EARLE: At this point, my objection would be that you're becoming argumentive because counsel present in the room has instructed the witness not to answer that question based on the scope of Rule 26. You have a disagreement with counsel over on the scope of Rule 26. So I don't know that there's much profit at this point in arguing about that. MS. LAZAR: Well, my question then is are you instructing him not to answer that | | | |

```
Q And are you going to follow the advice of counsel?
                                                                     leadership in each house as well as some of the
 2
                                                              2
    A I will, ves.
                                                                     legislative support staff to discuss kind of
 3
    Q Before you were retained in the summer of 2011 by
                                                              3
                                                                     preparatory procedures for the redistricting
 4
       Godfrey & Kahn, did you contact the Government
                                                               4
                                                                     process. So they work to discuss what kinds of
 5
                                                              5
       Accountability Board with respect to any
                                                                     computer technology will be necessary, what it
       information in 2011?
                                                              6
                                                                     will take to physically draft the redistricting
 7
                                                              7
    A Any information?
                                                                     legislation when it becomes time, what sorts, if
 8
    Q Any information, any contacts with the Government
                                                              8
                                                                     any, public access there will be to the
       Accountability Board before you were retained?
                                                              9
                                                                     redistricting process and that kind of thing. And
10
                                                              10
    A I would have to -- I don't know for certain. As I
                                                                     it's -- I don't believe they have any formal
11
                                                             11
       say, I have periodic contact with them and attend
                                                                     authority. They kind of make recommendations and
12
                                                              12
       their monthly meetings.
                                                                     then the legislature within their more formal
13
                                                             13
                    MS. LAZAR: I'd like to take a
                                                                     structure would actually approve anything.
14
                                                              14
            short break, and then we may almost be over
                                                                  Q And is that a bipartisan group?
15
                                                              15
            unless your counsel has more questions. So
                                                                  A Yes.
16
                                                              16
            Peter, we're going to go off the record, but
                                                                  Q In some of the other e-mails I saw some mentions
17
                                                              17
            I would suggest you just stay on the phone.
                                                                     of an AFSCME committee conference call or meeting:
18
                                                              18
                    MR. EARLE: Okay.
                                                                     did you attend any of those regarding
19
                                                              19
                    THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
                                                                     redistricting in 2011?
20
            10:05. We are going off the record.
                                                              20
                                                                 A I don't recall that call specifically. I guess I
21
                                                             21
                                                                     would have to see what the e-mails were to respond
                (Recess taken)
                                                             22
22
                    THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
                                                                     to that.
23
                                                              23
                                                                  Q Do you recall attending any with that group in
            11:51. We are back on the record.
24
                                                             24
                    MS. LAZAR: Thank you, Mr. Gratz.
                                                                     2011 regarding redistricting?
25
                                                              25
            We took a short break there to take care of
                                                                 A In 2011, I don't recall specifically.
                           49
                                                                                         51
 1
            some other litigation business. Before -- or
                                                                  Q How about any meetings with the Democratic Party
                                                              1
 2
                                                              2
            during that break, I was advised by your
                                                                     Wisconsin in 2011 regarding redistricting?
 3
                                                              3
                                                                  A I recall attending at least one meeting with the
            counsel that they were going to be removing
            the opposition to the one question I had
                                                                     Democratic Party regarding redistricting.
            asked. And I'd ask the court reporter to
                                                                  Q And approximately, if you know, when was that?
 6
                                                              6
                                                                  A I -- it was prior to the introduction of any
            look up that one question so it's read back
 7
            to you, so I can't change it. If you can
                                                                     redistricting bills is all I can say specifically.
 8
            read that question back, please.
                                                                  Q And who, if you recall, who was at that meeting?
 q
                (Ouestion read)
                                                              9
                                                                  A I won't recall every participant who was there.
10
                                                              10
    A Yes.
                                                                     It was leadership from the Democratic Party, so it
11
    Q And that was in November of 2011, correct?
                                                              11
                                                                     would have been Chairman Mike Tate as well as some
                                                              12
12
    A To the best of my recollection.
                                                                     of their other staff people. There were
13
                                                              13
    {f Q} Okay. I just have a few more general questions
                                                                     representatives from legislative leadership there.
14
                                                              14
       that I'm going to ask you, and then Mr. Kelly is
                                                                     You know, both Representative Barca's staff of
                                                              15
15
       going to ask you a few questions about the CD,
                                                                     some sort, Representative Miller's staff, and
                                                              16
16
       which was marked as Exhibit 1027, and we also have
                                                                     beyond that, I could not say. You know, I don't
17
                                                              17
       put that in the computer so you can look at those.
                                                                     have a recollection beyond that for sure.
                                                             18
18
       We also have some printouts. First of all, when
                                                                  Q And if you recall, what was the topic of that
19
       reading some of the e-mails, I noticed the name of
                                                              19
                                                                     meeting?
20
                                                             20
       a study group called the Redistricting Study
                                                                  A The topic, there were a number of topics, but I
21
                                                              21
       Working Group. What is that group?
                                                                     think we talked about redistricting timeline and
22
                                                             22
    A It is a -- and actually, I may have misstated. I
                                                                     process. I think I spoke about what kind of
23
                                                              23
       thought the name was Redistricting Staff Working
                                                                     typically when redistricting bills are introduced,
24
       Group, but whichever case. It is a committee that
                                                              24
                                                                     when the census data is available, you know, kind
25
                                                             25
       consists of both designees of the legislative
                                                                     of overview of the process, and then there was
```

| | | VIDEOTALE DEL COLLIGIA O | | | | |
|--|------------------|--|--|--|--|--|
| 1 | | discussion of, you know, how and when they should | 1 | | that's 2011, would that refresh your recollection? | |
| 2 | | consider, you know, engaging in any kind of legal | 2 | Α | That would seem reasonable. | |
| 3 | | counsel. | 3 | Q | And what did you discuss with Professor Nordheim | |
| 4 | Q | Was there any strike that. You mentioned that | 4 | | on those dates? | |
| 5 | | you discussed certain things. Did you give a | 5 | Α | He would have asked me for some you know, to | |
| 6 | | slight presentation as to timeline and procedure? | 6 | 6 utilize the redistricting software I would have | | |
| 7 | Α | I believe I gave I did not give a PowerPoint or | 7 | 7 and the map files to produce at his request some | | |
| 8 | | that kind of presentation. There may have been a | 8 numbers that looked at some of the redistricting | | | |
| 9 | | handout that would have just kind of had timeline | 9 stats. | | | |
| 10 | | and dates. This is the date when census data is | 10 Q For Professor Nordheim's report, did you use | | | |
| 11 | | available. This is the date when municipalities | 11 | | Autobound to come up with some figures and tables | |
| 12 | | have to have their wards created and those types | 12 | | for him? | |
| 13 | | of that type of timeline. | 13 | Α | Yes, I did. | |
| 14 | Q | And was there any discussion, if you can recall, | 14 | _ | Did you see have you ever seen | |
| 15 | _ | at that meeting where the introduction of maps on | 15 | _ | Professor Nordheim's expert report dated | |
| 16 | | behalf of the democrats was discussed? | 16 | | December 13th, 2011? | |
| 17 | Δ | Where actual maps were discussed or whether there | 17 | Δ | I believe so. I don't think I've read his report | |
| 18 | ^ | should be maps? | 18 | ^ | in its entirety. | |
| 19 | 0 | Let's take both of those. Where actual maps were | 19 | 0 | Did you see that before it was submitted or after? | |
| 20 | Q | | 20 | _ | | |
| | | discussed? | | _ | I only saw it after. | |
| 21 22 | ^ | There was no discussion of actual maps. There | 21 | Q | Did you draft any portions of Professor Nordheim's | |
| | | were neither actual maps nor really discussion of | 22 | | report? | |
| 23 | _ | what maps should look like. | 23 | A | I did not. | |
| 24 | Q | Was there any discussion in general as to whether | 24 | | MS. LAZAR: Those are all of my | |
| 25 | | a map for the democrats should be introduced? | 25 | | questions. Mr. Kelly is going to ask you | |
| _ | | 53 | | | 55 | |
| 1 | Α | I don't recall for certain whether there was or | 1 | | some questions now regarding the | |
| 2 | | not. | 2 | | MR. EARLE: I didn't hear what his | |
| _ | _ | | _ | | | |
| 3 | Q | Okay. Do you know who Erik Nordheim is? | 3 | | response was. | |
| 4 | _ | Okay. Do you know who Erik Nordheim is? Yes, I do. | 4 | | response was. MS. LAZAR: To the question whether | |
| 4 5 | A | | 4 5 | | _ | |
| 4 5 6 | A | Yes, I do. | 4 5 6 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether | |
| 4 5 | A | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in | 4 5 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? | |
| 4 5 6 | A Q | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional | 4 5 6 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. | |
| 4 5 6 7 | A Q A | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? | 4 5 6 7 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 | A Q A | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. | 4 5 6 7 8 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A Q A | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the | 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 | A Q A Q | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that | 4 5 6 7 8 9 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | A Q A Q | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that correct? | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I heard. Thank you. Now I'm going to have | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 | A Q A Q | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I heard. Thank you. Now I'm going to have Mr. Kelly ask some questions regarding the | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | A Q A Q | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Did you participate in and/or meet with | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I heard. Thank you. Now I'm going to have Mr. Kelly ask some questions regarding the document. And for the record, the CD that | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 | A Q A Q | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Did you participate in and/or meet with Professor Nordheim to assist in the preparation of | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I heard. Thank you. Now I'm going to have Mr. Kelly ask some questions regarding the document. And for the record, the CD that you produced as Exhibit 1027 has now been | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | A Q A Q A | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Did you participate in and/or meet with Professor Nordheim to assist in the preparation of his expert report? | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I heard. Thank you. Now I'm going to have Mr. Kelly ask some questions regarding the document. And for the record, the CD that you produced as Exhibit 1027 has now been loaded into a computer, and you have access | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A Q A Q A Q | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Did you participate in and/or meet with Professor Nordheim to assist in the preparation of his expert report? I have met with him, yes. | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I heard. Thank you. Now I'm going to have Mr. Kelly ask some questions regarding the document. And for the record, the CD that you produced as Exhibit 1027 has now been loaded into a computer, and you have access to that CD; is that correct? | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | A Q A Q A Q | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Did you participate in and/or meet with Professor Nordheim to assist in the preparation of his expert report? I have met with him, yes. And when did you meet with him? | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I heard. Thank you. Now I'm going to have Mr. Kelly ask some questions regarding the document. And for the record, the CD that you produced as Exhibit 1027 has now been loaded into a computer, and you have access to that CD; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That is correct. | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | A Q A Q A Q | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Did you participate in and/or meet with Professor Nordheim to assist in the preparation of his expert report? I have met with him, yes. And when did you meet with him? I don't have specific dates. I met with him on a | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I heard. Thank you. Now I'm going to have Mr. Kelly ask some questions regarding the document. And for the record, the CD that you produced as Exhibit 1027 has now been loaded into a computer, and you have access to that CD; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That is correct. MS. LAZAR: Mr. Kelly? | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | A Q A Q A Q A | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Did you participate in and/or meet with Professor Nordheim to assist in the preparation of his expert report? I have met with him, yes. And when did you meet with him? I don't have specific dates. I met with him on a number of occasions. My on a number of | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I heard. Thank you. Now I'm going to have Mr. Kelly ask some questions regarding the document. And for the record, the CD that you produced as Exhibit 1027 has now been loaded into a computer, and you have access to that CD; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That is correct. MS. LAZAR: Mr. Kelly? MR. KELLY: I have a handful of | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | A Q A Q A Q A | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Did you participate in and/or meet with Professor Nordheim to assist in the preparation of his expert report? I have met with him, yes. And when did you meet with him? I don't have specific dates. I met with him on a number of occasions. My on a number of occasions over the last month or so. | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I heard. Thank you. Now I'm going to have Mr. Kelly ask some questions regarding the document. And for the record, the CD that you produced as Exhibit 1027 has now been loaded into a computer, and you have access to that CD; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That is correct. MS. LAZAR: Mr. Kelly? MR. KELLY: I have a handful of exhibits that I'm just going to pass around | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | A Q A Q A Q A | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Did you participate in and/or meet with Professor Nordheim to assist in the preparation of his expert report? I have met with him, yes. And when did you meet with him? I don't have specific dates. I met with him on a number of occasions. My on a number of occasions over the last month or so. I don't have the exhibit, but I can tell you that | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I heard. Thank you. Now I'm going to have Mr. Kelly ask some questions regarding the document. And for the record, the CD that you produced as Exhibit 1027 has now been loaded into a computer, and you have access to that CD; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That is correct. MS. LAZAR: Mr. Kelly? MR. KELLY: I have a handful of exhibits that I'm just going to pass around all of them to you now so we don't have to | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | A Q A Q A Q A | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Did you participate in and/or meet with Professor Nordheim to assist in the preparation of his expert report? I have met with him, yes. And when did you meet with him? I don't have specific dates. I met with him on a number of occasions. My on a number of occasions over the last month or so. I don't have the exhibit, but I can tell you that one of Professor Nordheim's exhibits is an invoice | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I heard. Thank you. Now I'm going to have Mr. Kelly ask some questions regarding the document. And for the record, the CD that you produced as Exhibit 1027 has now been loaded into a computer, and you have access to that CD; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That is correct. MS. LAZAR: Mr. Kelly? MR. KELLY: I have a handful of exhibits that I'm just going to pass around all of them to you now so we don't have to go | |
| 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | A Q A Q A Q A | Yes, I do. Professor Erik Nordheim is one of the experts in this case on behalf of the congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Professor Nordheim has been retained by the intervenor congressional democrats; is that correct? That is my understanding. Did you participate in and/or meet with Professor Nordheim to assist in the preparation of his expert report? I have met with him, yes. And when did you meet with him? I don't have specific dates. I met with him on a number of occasions. My on a number of occasions over the last month or so. I don't have the exhibit, but I can tell you that one of Professor Nordheim's exhibits is an invoice which has certain dates listed, December 7th, | 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 23 | | MS. LAZAR: To the question whether he drafted the report? MR. EARLE: I heard your question. The answer seemed to block out. THE WITNESS: I did not draft his report or any portion of it. MS. LAZAR: That's the answer I heard. Thank you. Now I'm going to have Mr. Kelly ask some questions regarding the document. And for the record, the CD that you produced as Exhibit 1027 has now been loaded into a computer, and you have access to that CD; is that correct? THE WITNESS: That is correct. MS. LAZAR: Mr. Kelly? MR. KELLY: I have a handful of exhibits that I'm just going to pass around all of them to you now so we don't have to go MS. LAZAR: How do you want these | |

```
1
                     MR. EARLE: By the way, Dan, thanks
                                                                      was one in the previous year that was on the
 2
                                                               2
            for the e-mail. I got all three.
                                                                      upcoming redistricting process.
 3
                    MR. KELLY: Good, good. Excellent.
                                                               3
                                                                  Q You mentioned that you used this presentation or
                     MS. LAZAR: Okay. We're going to
                                                               4
                                                                      versions of it several times. Is this -- would
 5
                                                               5
            mark these five in this order, and we'll take
                                                                      this be the actual version that you presented to
            a second to do that.
                                                                      the Wisconsin Association of Lobbyists?
 7
                                                               7
                (Exhibit Nos. 1028 through 1031 marked
                                                                  A Looking at this one, I think this is different
 8
                                                               8
                                                                      than the one I gave -- because this one appears to
                 for identification)
 9
                    MR. KELLY: Wendy, are you good
                                                               9
                                                                      be one before there were districts introduced. I
10
                                                              10
            with the exhibit numbers?
                                                                     believe the one that I gave to the more recent,
11
                    MS ARENDS: Yes
                                                              11
                                                                      the 2011 lobbyists association, probably included
12
                                                              12
                                                                      some map images of the Act 43 districts.
13
                                                              13
                                                                  \boldsymbol{\mathsf{Q}}\, Do you have a copy of that file, the one that you
                    EXAMINATION
                                                              14
14
    By Mr. Kelly:
                                                                      actually presented to the Wisconsin Association of
15
                                                              15
    Q Mr. Gratz, could you take a look at what has been
                                                                      Lobbyists in 2011?
16
                                                              16
       marked Exhibit 1028, I believe it's in front of
                                                                  A I believe it was on the CD. I would have to look
17
                                                              17
       you, and tell me what that is.
                                                                      through the document.
18
                                                              18
                                                                  Q Yeah, if you want to take a moment and see if you
    A This is a printout of a PowerPoint that describes
19
                                                              19
       the redistricting process in Wisconsin, or you
                                                                      can find it on there, that would be great.
20
       know, mostly in Wisconsin. This would be a
                                                              20
                                                                  A Okay. I see now actually what I had was not a
                                                                      PowerPoint at that time. There's a folder that's
21
                                                              21
       presentation that I've given a number of times
22
                                                              22
       over the years.
                                                                      called Discovery Reply and then another folder
23
                                                              23
                                                                      within that called WAL Presentation Maps. That
    Q How many -- did you make any presentation with
24
                                                              24
       this document in 2011?
                                                                      appears to be the maps that I would have shown at
25
                                                              25
   A I could not tell you exactly when I would have
                                                                      that time. So it may not have been that I put it
                                                                                          59
 1
       given presentations. I've used this or a version
                                                               1
                                                                      into a PowerPoint form.
 2
       of this presentation a number of times, probably
                                                               2
                                                                  Q Do you -- do you think you would have used
 3
       going back to two years or more.
                                                               3
                                                                      Exhibit 1028 as part of that presentation along
 4
    Q And what kind of organizations would you make this
                                                                      with the maps?
       presentation to?
                                                                  A I can't recall for certain.
                                                                  \boldsymbol{\mathsf{Q}} All right. Let's talk about maps in that WAL
 6
                                                               6
    A I would have at different times made this to
 7
       legislators. I would have made it to nonprofit
                                                               7
                                                                      presentation maps folder.
 8
       groups that might be interested in redistricting
                                                                                   MS. ARENDS: Sorry, we're just
 q
       or in the census process. There were probably
                                                               9
                                                                          having a little bit of a delay here.
10
                                                              10
                                                                  A Okay.
       portions of this that may have been part of the
11
       presentation I gave to the lobbyists. It would
                                                              11
                                                                  Q Are these subparts of the maps passed by Act 43?
12
       have, you know, been both legislators and interest
                                                              12
                                                                  A Just a moment while it opens it up here.
13
                                                              13
                                                                  Q Sure. Is it working for you? Did we give you a
       groups at different times.
14
                                                              14
    Q And what lobbyists would those have been?
                                                                      dreadfully slow computer?
                                                              15
15
    A That would have been the lobbyist association
                                                                  A The computer seems to be slow. It's making noise,
16
                                                              16
       meeting that I was -- well, both the lobbyist
                                                                     but we just have the hourglass.
17
                                                              17
                                                                                   MS. ARENDS: It says it's not
       association meeting that we talked about earlier,
18
                                                              18
       as well as, I believe, a year to year and a half
                                                                          responding at this point.
19
                                                              19
                                                                                   MR. KELLY: Well, that's helpful.
       ago, I gave a presentation that kind of talked
20
                                                              20
                                                                                   MS. ARENDS: Is there an
       about the process more than the map outcome.
21
                                                              21
                                                                          alternative way to do this?
    Q The meeting with the lobbyist or the presentation
22
                                                              22
       to the lobbyist that we talked about earlier, was
                                                                                   MR. KELLY: Still doing nothing?
23
                                                              23
       that the one in August of 2011?
                                                                                   MS. ARENDS: Yeah, we're having
    A There would have been one in August of 2011, and I
                                                              24
                                                                          trouble here.
25
                                                              25
       believe there was one in August 2010. Well, there
                                                                                   MR. KELLY: Let me come over there
```

 ${f Q}$ Does that collection of maps cover the entire 1 and see if I can bring some discipline to the 2 process. Just my luck I give you a defective 2 state? 3 computer. 3 A No, it just covers those specific regions. MS. ARENDS: Maria, do you want to 4 There's no state-wide map here. 5 5 go off the record while we solve this? Q Were you the one who selected what regions to --6 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is to present at the Wisconsin Association of 7 7 12:12. We are going off the record. Lobbyists meeting? 8 A Yes, I would have. (Recess taken) 9 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is Q Why did you choose those? 10 12:20. We are back on the record. 10 A I think I chose these for different reasons. I 11 11 Q All right. Mr. Gratz, we were talking about a knew that these are, first and foremost, the most 12 12 presentation that you made to the Wisconsin populus parts of the state. So I wanted the 13 Association of Lobbyists, and you mentioned that 13 lobbyists to be able to, you know, get a good 14 14 there were some maps that were included in that overview of those parts of the maps that 15 presentation, and you directed us to the CD and a 15 represented the most people. And then in a few of 16 folder marked W -- something like WAL presentation 16 the cases, I highlighted, you know, specific 17 17 maps; is that correct? things within those maps that -- that might be of 18 A Correct. 18 interest to them. 19 19 Q So do you see that folder and its contents on the Q And what kind of things do you recall having 20 computer screen in front of you? 20 highlighted for them? 21 21 A Well, the one thing that stands out in my mind A I do, yes. 22 22 Q Can you tell me, looking at that, now you clicked most significantly is in the Racine, Kenosha 23 23 on a map, which map file is that? files. The fact that the way the maps were drawn A I have open a map file that's Fox Valley Assembly. 24 had the effect of disenfranchising a very large 25 25 number of people. Q All right. Tell me what that is. 63 1 A This is a map of roughly the Fox Valley area, 1 Q Why would the Wisconsin Association of Lobbyists 2 Green Bay to Appleton, and the surrounding area be interested in that? 3 3 that shows the Assembly districts in what A I think they were just generally interested in eventually became Act 43. what the redistricting maps looked like and what Q So this file was prepared before Act 43 was impact they had on people across Wisconsin and in 6 6 passed? their job as political professionals. 7 A This was -- actually, I believe this was prepared 7 Q You mentioned that you selected the regions to after it was actually Act 43, or at least after it present to them based on the population, the fact q q was passed by the legislature. that these were the most populus areas; is that 10 10 Q All right. Could you go back to the folder list, correct? 11 the file list there. 11 A That's correct. 12 12 A Uh-huh. Q Why would the lobbyists be interested in the most 13 13 Q And tell me, just in general terms, what each of populated areas? 14 14 those other files represents? A Well, I think lobbyists are, you know, usually 15 A So there are two Fox Valley files, one for the 15 interested in what, you know, political 16 16 implications there will be from the redistricting Assembly, which I just described, a similar one 17 17 that appears for the State Senate. There is a map maps, how it affects, you know, who may -- you 18 18 that's named Milwaukee, Waukesha Assembly, which I know, who may be the representatives who they 19 19 presume will be the Milwaukee and surrounding continue to lobby or don't continue to lobby. And 20 20 areas, the Assembly districts. There are two so by showing the greatest number of districts. it 21 files called Racine, Kenosha, Assembly and Senate, 21

22 which would be that region of the state, and those Q Was part of the purpose of your presentation to 23 districts from Act 43, and then there are two help them understand who may or may not be in the files, South Central Dane Assembly and Senate, 24 legislature in the following year so they would

gives them the biggest overview of that aspect.

which would be that region.

22

23

25

- VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF JOEL A. GRATZ 1/30/2012 A Yes, I would say so. in the legislative process. 2 Q And did you help them understand who may or may 2 Q Sure. Let me try that again. Given the analysis 3 not be in the legislature in future years? 3 of what you presented to the Wisconsin Association A I would hope so. I don't know what effect it had 4 of Lobbyists, did you conclude that democratic 5 5 in the end, though. lawmakers would have an opportunity to participate 6 Q Can you tell me how you helped them understand who 6 in the legislative process after adoption of this 7 7 may or may not be in the legislature in future map? 8 8 A I guess I have trouble knowing what participate in A Well, another aspect of the maps that I would have 9 the legislative process means. Yeah, I have 10 talked about, when I just had the Fox Valley map 10 trouble synthesizing what you want to ask by that. 11 11 open, one of the things that the map shows is Q Let's break that down a little bit. They have an 12 12 which incumbents now reside within the same opportunity to be elected? 13 district. So I would have talked about that these 13 A In some places, correct. 14 14 incumbent representatives are now paired, and Q And once elected, they would have the ability to 15 15 we'll either have to -- one or the other of them propose legislation? 16 16 will no longer be able to continue unless they A I presume so. 17 17 relocate to another district. So that would have Q Participate in debates? 18 been one aspect. I would have talked about kind 18 MS. ARENDS: Objection, this calls 19 19 of the politics of the area and how the maps may for speculation. 20 have impacted representatives or a challenger of 20 A I believe legislators, as far as I know, are 21 21 another party's ability to be successful in a allowed to participate in debates. 22 22 ${f Q}$ Is there anything about Act 43, after your campaign. 23 23 Q Did you provide any overall sense of what the analysis, that suggests that the democrats would 24 partisan balance of the legislature might be in 24 not have a fair ability to participate in the 25 25 continuing years after adoption of these maps? legislative process? A I believe so, yes. 1 A Well, I would say that, you know, the most 1 2 2 Q What did you tell them? effective way to participate in the legislative 3 3 process is, you know, the ability to get your A I -- well, I believe what I told them to the best of my recollection is that, you know, this was a bills passed or get them to -- you know, at least map that, you know, was going to be more difficult get them to a floor debate, and a map that 6 6 for democrats to be elected under, but did not disadvantages them tremendously so they were in a 7 leave them without opportunities for election. 7 small minority makes that more difficult. 8 Q And what did you mean by it would not leave them 8 Q Do you think the Wisconsin Association of q without opportunities for election? 9 Lobbyists is interested in the partisan makeup of 10 10 A Well, I probably highlighted that there are some the legislature? 11 districts that were -- you know, did become very 11 A I don't know that I have an answer to that. 12 democratic. There's a -- both in Green Bay and in 12 Q Did you make your presentation to the Wisconsin 13 13 Eau Claire, there would have been districts that Association of Lobbyists with the purpose or 14 14 were now tremendously or much more democratic than intent of demonstrating what the partisan makeup 15 15 they were in the past. But would have also of the legislature might be under these maps? 16 16 highlighted the trade-off that often those were A I feel like I mainly talked to them about, you 17 know, what the impact was. I don't know that I
 - 17 created at the expense of the ability for
- 18 democrats to be successful in several other
- 19 districts.
- 20 Q Was it your understanding that the democrats under 21 these new maps would still be able to participate 22 in the legislative process in ongoing years?
- 23 MS. ARENDS: Objection to the form
- of that question.
- ${\bf 25}$ A I'm a little unclear about unable to participate

- 18 speculated on what the complete partisan makeup
- 19 would be, but that, you know, zeroed in on some
- 20 specific areas and the impact it would have, 21 legislators being paired, some districts being
- 22 made better for one party or the other and vice
- 23
- 24 Q The presentation that you made to the Wisconsin 25 Association of Lobbyists, that was drafted

entirely by you? A You know, a personal opinion would be that the 2 A Yes. 2 maps are decidedly partisan. 3 ${f Q}$ And as you mentioned, this is a presentation that Q And why did you conclude that they are decidedly you've used over the years; is that right? 4 partisan? 5 5 A These maps that we're speaking of here would have A A variety of factors. But again, going back to 6 6 just -- I believe that these maps were ones that I something like the disenfranchisement that 7 7 created and used only for the preparation to them. happened in Racine and Kenosha and what appears to 8 Q Okay. But the PowerPoint is something that you 8 have been for a significant partisan reason. have used over the years? 9 Q What do you think that significant partisan reason 10 10 A Correct, the PowerPoint on the process of was for the Racine and Kenosha portion of the map? 11 11 redistricting. MS. ARENDS: Objection, calls for 12 12 Q Whose idea was it to create that PowerPoint speculation. 13 13 presentation? A You know, my personal opinion is that looking at 14 14 A Well, I was invited to speak at the -- the it, it takes two Senate districts that would 15 15 Lobbyists Association meeting. I believe they, otherwise -- you know, each party have a chance of 16 whoever invited me, said we'd like to see some 16 representing one or the other or both of those 17 maps of some different regions and what the impact 17 Senate districts and makes that impossible. 18 18 is. So that request came from them, and then I, Q How did it make it impossible? 19 19 you know, decided, you know, the details of A It makes one district tremendously republican and 20 what I was going to provide. You know, the other 20 one district tremendously democratic. 21 21 Q Is there any benefit to you or any of your part of the presentation was given by 22 22 Representative Handrick, and I would have also business interests in making these types of 23 23 commented on some of the presentation materials he presentations to the Wisconsin Association of 24 24 would have presented. Lobbyists? 25 25 Q Do you know why they asked both you and A I think the main benefit for my appearing there 1 1 Mr. Handrick to make presentations to them? was that from time to time I'm, you know, hired by 2 2 A I, you know, I don't know for sure what their lobbyists to conduct surveys or public opinion 3 motive would be. 3 research, and it's, you know, a good opportunity Q As you did the presentation, did you notice any just to, you know, network and connect with the dissimilarity in the way that you approached the folks there. 6 6 ${f Q}$ Is there about the presentation that you did that topic that you were presenting on between you and 7 Mr. Handrick? 7 would make it either more or less likely that you 8 A I think that, you know, Mr. Handrick presented, 8 would be retained about any of the lobbyists? q you know, a viewpoint different than mine in terms 9 A I don't know that there's anything about these 10 10 of suggesting, you know, the fairness and maps or the presentation, no. I think, you know, 11 appropriateness of the outcome of the maps. 11 the ability to work with them is mainly an 12 12 Q And what was the emphasis of your presentation? opportunity to, you know, present to them, talk to 13 13 A I think I talked about, as we mentioned before, them, and you know, gain credibility with them, I 14 14 some things like that Racine and Kenosha, how the would say. 15 map was drawn, disenfranchised a number of people. 15 Q After you were finished with the presentation, did 16 Q Are you at all concerned about the way the map was 16 you have an opportunity to talk with any of the 17 17 written? attendees? 18 18 MS. ARENDS: Objection. A I believe so. I don't remember specifics of that, 19 A I -- outside of my personal opinion, I don't think 19 but we certainly talked after I was done. 20 20 I've, you know, been asked to talk about its Q Do you recall any of the topics of conversation 21 fairness. 21 that you had with them? 22 22 Q So you don't have any opinion or position with A Not specifically, no. 23 23 respect to the -- whether the maps were slanted in Q Do you remember anyone in particular with whom you 24 a partisan way, one direction or another? might have talked after that presentation? 25 MS. ARENDS: Objection. 25 A I, you know, talked to a number of them, but you

1 know, I have people who are friends who are years that would have, you know, provided me 2 2 lobbyists, I probably would have talked to more, information that would have gone into this. 3 you know, just because of a social nature, I would ${f 3}$ ${f Q}$ Let's turn to the second to last page, and if you 4 have talked to not really about these things, but 4 take a look at that page and the one that follows? 5 5 life in general. But I don't, you know, I don't A Just to confirm the page, the first one says race 6 really call it, you know, any kind of and redistricting, and the second one says 7 7 comprehensive list of who I talked to. redistricting principles and criteria? 8 Q Let's go back to Exhibit 1028 for a moment. 8 Q Correct. Where would you have gotten the material 9 Mr. Gratz, I might have missed this this morning, for those two pages? 10 10 A I couldn't recall specifically. It may have -- it and I apologize if I did. What is your background 11 11 in redistricting? probably most likely came from materials I would 12 12 A My -- well, my formal involvement in redistricting have received at conferences on redistricting by 13 13 began with the census and redistricting process the National Conference of State Legislatures. 14 14 during the 2000 and subsequent years when I Q All right. Let's go back to the computer, and if 15 15 actually drew maps for the Senate democrats that you would just hit a key anywhere, that should 16 were passed by the State -- State Senate at that 16 bring it back up or not actually. 17 17 MR. KELLY: Let's go off the record time and analysis I would have provided for 18 litigation at that time. Actually, my interest 18 for just a moment so I can resurrect the 19 19 goes back to the 1990s while I was in college, and computer. 20 I worked quite a bit with the public access 20 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 21 21 12:40. We are going off the record. terminals at that time where the public could work 22 on redistricting maps. That was kind of my first 22 (Recess taken) 23 time familiarizing myself with the software and 23 THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is 24 24 technology and background of redistricting. 12:43. We are back on the record. 25 25 Q Now, you mentioned that the material in Q Mr. Gratz, could you take what has been marked 75 1 1 Exhibit 1029 from the documents that are in front Exhibit 1028 is something that you have used over 2 the years. Do you recall when you would have 2 of you. Can you tell me what that is? 3 3 first compiled this information into a A This was a memo that I wrote to representative presentation? Peter Barca describing, you know, how to proceed A I would not recall specifically, no. on, you know, in regards to redistricting 6 Q Would this have been -- do you know if it would 6 legislation now that they were not in the 7 have been before or after the 2000 census? 7 majority, and the democrats were not in the A It would have been -- this would something I would majority in the State Assembly. q have prepared well after the 2000 census. 9 Q Who asked to you prepare that memo? 10 10 Q Would it have been before or after the Senate was A I don't know that I was asked specifically. It 11 considering a redistricting map in 2001 or 2002? 11 would have come out of conversations I would have 12 12 A It would have been well after that. had with his staff and perhaps other legislative 13 13 Q And by well after that, would we say mid decade members. I don't recall. 14 14 Q Out of those conversations, do you recall what the 2005? 15 15 A I mean, I would say this was something I probably specific purpose or the specific request was to 16 first began -- prepared somewhere in the, you 16 you that resulted in this memo? 17 17 know, last three years of the -- of the decade, A Could you say that again, please? 18 18 ${f Q}$ Sure. Out of those conversations, whoever they you know. Broadly 2007 too 2009 would have been 19 when I probably first created a version of this 19 were with, do you recall what the particular 20 20 document. request they made of you that resulted in this 21 21 Q Okay. Did you have any assistance in gathering memo, which is Exhibit 1029?

ting over the 25 know, whether i

23

24

22 A I don't know that that -- as I say, I'm not sure

that a specific request was made of me. I think

know, whether it was asked of me specifically or I

we had probably had some discussions, and you

22

23

24

25

the material that went into Exhibit 1028?

A Direct assistance? Direct assistance, I would say

no. I certainly have attended conferences and

other presentations on redistricting over the

thought it would be helpful for them to have a few is -- that starts process, and the remainder of 2 2 notes on, you know, how to proceed with the page outlines kind of discussion topics for a 3 redistricting as a minority. 3 meeting with legislative leaders. Judging by the 4 Q Were you retained by anyone in the legislature to 4 attendees listed at the top, these -- this would 5 5 provide consulting services? have been a meeting that took place sometime in 6 6 A I was not, no. 2010 when Mike Sheridan was still the speaker. So 7 7 ${f Q}$ Down on the bottom of the memo, there's a heading it was discussion points for a meeting I would 8 Funding Resources. Can you tell me what the point 8 have had with them on how we should prepare for of the funding resources section of the memo was? redistricting in the future legislative section. 10 10 A The purpose here was to discuss in past And then the attendees portion at the top would 11 11 redistrictings the legislature would have have been notes to myself just on which 12 12 allocated funds themselves for, you know, legal or legislators at least were present at that meeting 13 13 other resources for redistricting. But with and what years they had served in the legislature. 14 14 the -- but with both party -- both houses, the Q All right. So this document is something that you 15 democrats being in the minority, that did not seem 15 prepared? 16 16 that would likely be the case. And so this was A Yes. 17 laying out for them, you know, where else they may 17 Q Do you recall who requested this meeting? 18 18 be able to go to pay for some of the work they A It would have been a meeting that I would have --19 19 you know, Speaker Sheridan's office would have would need to, you know, either advocate for their 20 own plan or follow -- challenge any plan that was 20 requested it. It would have come out of 21 21 conversations I would have had with them at some passed. 22 22 Q Do you know if they pursued any of these funding point in 2010 about the need to prepare for the 23 23 redistricting process. 24 24 A I do not know specifically if any of these were Q Were they looking to you to provide some guidance 25 25 followed, no. to them on how to prepare for the redistricting 77 79 Q Did you have any discussions with Mr. Barca about 1 1 process? 2 this memorandum or the topics in this memorandum 2 A Yes. We had had discussions based upon the fact 3 after you provided it to him? 3 that I had, you know, was the one who had the most A I don't recall talking to him specifically about 4 experience in the legislature working on this memo, no. redistricting in the past. 6 Q My colleague and I noted that the date on this --6 Q And did you provide them direction and counsel on 7 it must have had a date field in the file, so it 7 the redistricting process? printed today's date? A We would have talked about the -- I would say yes, 9 A Yeah. I think my template for memos has an auto 9 we would have talked about the items on here, the 10 10 date field on it. timeline, and you know, what's necessary to create 11 Q All right. Would the actual date of this memo be 11 a redistricting plan. 12 the date of the file on the CD from which this was 12 Q And you mentioned that this would have been 13 13 taken? sometime in 2010; is that right? 14 14 A I would have to look at that file to know for A Given that Speaker Sheridan is listed on here, 15 sure. Yeah, I would have to look at the file to 15 yes, that would be correct. 16 16 Q Did you continue providing input, advice, and know for sure. 17 17 Q Why don't you go ahead and take a look and see if consultation to the democrat members of the 18 18 you can find that? legislature subsequent to this about the A It appears from how I named the file, which is 19 19 redistricting process? 20 Memo to Barca, 1/5/2010, that that was at least 20 A I talked to either them or their staff a few times 21 the date I first would have worked on this. 21 during 2010. 22 Q Let's turn now to Exhibit 1030, and would you look 22 Q Can you tell me about the content of those 23 23 at that, and tell me what that is.

20 of 43 sheets e 2:11-cwwww.fo.f-drefperecordinadis/dnlcorage 26084839-0302ent 146e 77 to 80 of 115

24

25

A It would have been follow -- I would attended some

of these redistricting staff working group

24

25

A This was -- I would say this -- I would

characterize this as two pieces. The bottom part

1 meetings. I would have communicated to them about A I looked at it. I couldn't characterize it much 2 2 those meetings, what was being done to prepare the beyond that. 3 technology for the whole legislature. We would 3 Q How did you come to obtain a copy of the map have also talked about how they wanted to proceed 4 Mr. Kessler was working on? 5 5 in terms of perhaps hiring counsel for the A At some point, he agreed to share it with me, and 6 redistricting process. I probably went to his office and made a copy of 7 7 Q Did there come a point in time when your it to load onto the computer that was in the 8 consultation with the democrat members of the Senate conference room. legislature ceased? Q Was it your idea to look at the map, or did 10 10 A I would not say it ceased. It continued into Mr. Kessler ask you to look at the map? 11 11 early 2011, but different members given the A I don't recall that exactly. 12 leadership in the -- among the Assembly democrats. Q What was your purpose in looking at the map? 13 Q And with whom were you conversing in 2011 about 13 A I believe that the legislators, whether it was 14 14 redistricting matters in the legislature? leadership in the Assembly or the Senate, you 15 15 A It would have shifted from Speaker Sheridan's know, were curious as to how it compared to the 16 16 plan that was introduced. I think that's the main office to Minority Leader Barca's office. 17 17 Q What kind of conversations did you have with his thing, how it compared. 18 office about redistricting? 18 ${f Q}$ Did the legislators ask you to compare the maps 19 19 A In the -- the early part of the year, I think we introduced by the republicans to the maps 20 probably talked somewhat about what was in that 20 developed by the democrats? 21 21 MS. ARENDS: Objection to form, other memo to Representative Barca. And then once 22 22 the plans were introduced in the legislature, they which legislators are we talking about here? 23 would have asked me for some information on, you 23 MR. KELLY: Any. 24 24 know, what those plans looked like and what they A I guess I'm confused. You say plan prepared by 25 25 did. the legislators. Can you be more specific which 81 83 Q And did you provide that kind of information? 1 plans are being compared? A I did at some times, yes. 2 Q Sure, yeah. There were maps introduced that Q Was that in writing, or was that verbal? 3 eventually became Act 43, correct? A It would have been both. A Correct. **Q** And the written input that you gave to them on Q And there were maps that you had looked at or 6 6 redistricting, is that included on the CD? worked on that the democratic members of the 7 A I would say the written input would mainly be the 7 legislature were assembling, correct? items that we discussed earlier, some of the 8 A There was the map I had worked on, and then there 9 Excel-type charts and tables, which indicated q was the map that Representative Kessler worked on. 10 10 Q Let's talk about the map that you worked on. You which members were paired, what the core retention 11 of the districts was, what the demographics of the 11 shared that with the legislators? I'm sorry. You 12 12 district were. shared that map with the democratic legislators? 13 13 Q Do you know what the legislators did with the A I would have shared it with the staff people of 14 14 information you gave them? the democratic leadership. 15 A I do not, no. 15 Q Did you share it with anyone else? 16 Q Do you know if they made any effort to draw any 16 A Not that I can recall. 17 17 Q What was the purpose of you sharing it with the redistricting maps themselves? 18 18 A Other than the map that we talked about earlier, staff members for the democratic members of the 19 19 which I worked on the one weekend. The only other legislature? 20 20 A The purpose would have been to show 'em -- show effort I know of is that Representative Kessler 21 21 worked on the map. them what progress we had made on the map and for 22 22 Q Did you assist Mr. Kessler with that map? them to make a determination whether they, you 23 23 A I did not, no. know, wanted to do anything with the map, I guess. Q Do you know about the contents of the map that 24 Q And when you say the progress that we made on the

map, are you referring to Forward Strategies or

Mr. Kessler was working on?

25

25

someone else? staff, Scott Adrian. And particularly, since this 2 2 A As I mentioned earlier, Mike White worked on the was a topic that had come out of the staff working 3 map a little bit as well. So it would have been, 3 group, I thought it was important to, you know, you know, progress that Mike and I had made. share the information with him. 5 Q Do you know if the democratic legislators did Q And did you eventually share this memorandum with 6 Mr. Adrian? anything with the maps that you were working on? 7 7 A I don't know -- I don't know if they did anything A I don't know for certain. more with them after that. As I say, the maps 8 Q Now, it is stamped Draft Confidential. Why would were I would not term complete. this have been confidential? 10 10 Q Did any of the democratic legislators ever ask you A I think that, you know, I would term it as a --11 11 to compare the maps that became Act 43 to the map you know, as you often do when you're, you know, 12 12 that you were working on? discussing potential legislation, you may keep it 13 A I don't recall for certain. confidential in the early stages before you've 14 14 Q Did any of the democratic legislators ask you for actually drafted anything. 15 15 Q Did you come to any conclusions about the topic of assistance in creating any other map? 16 16 drawing district -- legislative district maps 17 17 Q Are you aware of any other maps that the based on census blocks rather than wards? 18 18 A Come to any conclusion; I guess you would have to democratic legislators were working on? 19 19 A Outside of Representative Kessler's map, no. clarify what you're asking exactly. 20 Q Let's turn to Exhibit 1031. Can you take a look 20 Q Sure. In considering the question of basing 21 21 at that, and tell me what that is, please? legislative district maps on census blocks as 22 22 A This is a memo that I wrote to Scott Adrian at opposed to wards, did you see any -- anything that 23 the time who would have been on the staff of 23 would keep that from being a valid way of 24 24 Speaker Mike Sheridan that discusses whether developing --25 25 legislative districts could be drawn on census A I don't know that I talked here or thought about 87 1 1 whether it would be a valid way. You know, I blocks versus wards. 2 2 Q And again, the date on here is today's date discussed the impact on the timeline of when work 3 3 could be done. because that's when we printed it off. Could you take a look at the CD and determine, if you can, Q Do you know of anything that would prevent the identify the date this was actually written? legislature from being able to develop a 6 6 A The date that the CD has as last modified is legislative district map based on census blocks as 7 2/26/2010. So as near as I can tell, that would 7 opposed to wards? be the last date that I would have worked on it. MS. ARENDS: Objection, outside the q I probably have only worked on it a time or two. 9 scope. 10 10 **Q** Okay. What was the point of this Exhibit 1031? A The only -- what I know is that certainly at the 11 A The -- the point of it was, I believe, two-fold. 11 time I wrote this memo, it was -- it was not the 12 12 At one of the redistricting staff working groups, process. 13 13 $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{Q}}\,$ And in this memo, you note some advantages to there was a draft of a potential bill that was 14 14 actually brought forward, I believe, by one of the basing legislative district maps on census blocks 15 15 nonpartisan legislative reference bureau staff as opposed to wards; is that correct? 16 people that made some changes to the current law 16 A I don't know about advantages. I note that there 17 17 are -- it impacts the timeline in how you go about that would allow census blocks to be used instead 18 18 of ward boundaries for legislative and drawing the districts. 19 19 Q Can you take a look at the last paragraph on congressional maps. And then I, you know, talked 20 20 about some of the implications of this, and I page 2? 21 21 think, you know, advantages and disadvantages. A The last paragraph? 22 22 Q Correct. Q Who asked you to prepare this memorandum? 23 23 A Again, I don't know that I was asked specifically 24 to prepare it. The idea was that I had been 24 Q It says, "The last potential (while a very long 25 25 communicating with Representative Sheridan's shot in my opinion) consideration that Mike White

```
1
       mentioned was if the census was able to accelerate
                                                                         beginning of Disk No. 2 in the deposition of
 2
       the data release of data to January of 2011, if
                                                              2
                                                                         Mr. Joel Gratz.
 3
       plans could be drawn on blocks they could be
                                                              3
                                                                 \boldsymbol{\mathsf{Q}}\, Mr. Gratz, you have in front of you what has been
       completed before the current legislature and
                                                                     marked Exhibit 1032. I'll represent to you that
 5
                                                              5
       governor depart." Do you see that?
                                                                     these are e-mails that we printed off of the CD
 6
    A I do.
                                                                     that you -- your counsel provided to us this
 7
                                                              7
    Q Why would that be an advantage?
                                                                     morning. And if you should have any reason to
                                                                     question that as we go through these documents,
    A Well, again, I don't know about advantage or
                                                              8
       disadvantage. It discusses the timeline of when
                                                                     please do let me know. But for now, if we could
10
                                                             10
       plans could be drawn.
                                                                     just assume that this is a copy of what we took
11
                                                             11
    Q Would there be -- would there be anything
                                                                     from the CD, that would be great. I'd like you to
12
                                                             12
       beneficial to writing a map before the current
                                                                     look at the first page, to begin with. Down at
13
                                                             13
       legislature and governor depart, as you mentioned
                                                                     the bottom, there is --
14
                                                             14
       in your memo?
                                                                                 MR. EARLE: Hey Dan, is there a way
15
                                                             15
    A It discusses the timeline of when maps, you know,
                                                                         to get a mic near you or the phone or a mic
16
                                                             16
       could be drawn.
                                                                         near you somehow?
17
    Q Right. But it talks about in terms of potential.
                                                             17
                                                                                 MR. KELLY: Yeah. Let's see if we
18
       What is the potential?
                                                             18
                                                                         can move the phone a little closer.
                                                             19
19
    A It would mean that they would be drawn by the
                                                                                  MR. EARLE: I can hear Joel
20
       legislature at that time. You know, those who
                                                             20
                                                                         perfectly well, but you, you're talking from
21
                                                             21
       were in the legislature at that time during
                                                                         a tunnel there.
22
       January of 2011.
                                                             22
                                                                                 MR. KELLY: Well, and Peter, that's
23
    Q What was the -- and were the democrats or the
                                                             23
                                                                         probably because I'm so soft-spoken and
24
                                                             24
       republicans in the majority at that time?
                                                                         unassuming and retiring even.
25
                                                             25
                                                                                 MR. EARLE: We'll have to ask your
    A During the very first days of January, it would
 1
       have been the democrats.
                                                              1
                                                                         kids that question.
 2
                                                              2
    Q And there was a democrat in the -- as governor at
                                                                                  MR. KELLY: Don't. Is that any
 3
                                                              3
       that time as well, true?
                                                                         better, Peter?
    A During the first several days of the month.
                                                                                  MR. EARLE: Yeah, much better.
    Q Is that the potential that you were referencing in
                                                                                 MR. KELLY: Okay, great.
 6
                                                              6
                                                                 Q All right. So Mr. Gratz, we're looking at the
       this last paragraph, that the legislature and the
 7
       governorship were controlled by democrats?
                                                              7
                                                                    bottom of the page, there is an e-mail from
 8
                    MS. ARENDS: Objection, the
                                                                     Michelle McGrorty; do you see that?
 q
            document speaks for itself.
                                                              q
                                                                 A Correct.
10
                                                             10
                                                                 Q Who is she?
    A Yeah, I mean, it says that you could draw plans in
11
       January with the current legislature.
                                                             11
                                                                 A She works for the Greater Wisconsin Committee.
12
                                                             12
    Q And that current legislature being democratic?
                                                                 Q And what is that?
13
                                                             13
    A For the first several days of the month, they
                                                                 A They're a -- I'm not exactly sure how they're
14
                                                             14
       were, yes.
                                                                     constituted, but they're a group that does
                                                             15
15
    Q And the governor being democratic as well?
                                                                     political work. I would actually note that this
                                                             16
16
    A Until January 3rd, I believe.
                                                                     probably -- e-mail probably is outside the scope
17
                                                             17
                    THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
                                                                     of what was requested since it doesn't deal with
18
                                                             18
           1:05. We are going off the record
                                                                     the redistricting at all. I think it got included
19
            concluding Disk No. 1 of the deposition of
                                                             19
                                                                     because I searched for certain names such as
20
                                                             20
            Mr. Joel Gratz.
                                                                     Rich Judge, who works for the legislature, and
21
                                                             21
                (Recess taken)
                                                                     this must have gotten caught up in it.
22
                                                             22
                (Exhibit No. 1032 marked for
                                                                 Q All right. That's fair. So in the body of the
                                                             23
23
                 identification)
                                                                     e-mail when she refers to the toplines from the
24
                    THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are on the
                                                             24
                                                                     poll, that doesn't have anything to do with the
25
                                                             25
            record. The time is 1:17. This marks the
                                                                     redistricting effort?
```

A That is correct. done. So saving it one version to the next means 2 Q All right. Let's turn to an e-mail from 2 if something goes bad, you don't have to go back July 13th, 2011 from Jamie Kuhn to you. Looks to square one. like this, yeah. Q Would you have gotten any input from any of the 5 A Okay. democratic legislators on any of those versions? Q All right. That appears to be a forward of an 6 A I don't recall. I think the main reason for us 7 7 e-mail from Bill Lanier from the City of Madison; doing the versions and saving them was I worked 8 do you see that? 8 for a while, left it for him to do some work for a A Yes, I do. while, and so on. 10 10 Q Okay. Let's go three pages beyond that. At the Q Who is Bill Lanier? 11 11 A I have no idea. top of the page, there is a July 12th, 2011 e-mail 12 12 Q The subject is Redistricting PDF File. Do you from you to Mike White. Let's make sure we're on 13 13 recall if there was a redistricting PDF file the same page here? 14 14 A Yes, correct. attached to this? 15 A Well, just looking at the e-mail itself, it's 15 Q Below that in an e-mail from Mike White apparently 16 16 clear that there was a PDF file of some -- some to you, and he says Wow, those are some ugly 17 17 maps of the city of Madison attached to it. districts; do you see that? 18 18 A T do. Q What do these maps represent; do you know? 19 A I -- I don't personally recall looking at this --19 Q What districts was he commenting on? 20 I don't recall reading this e-mail. Looking at 20 A It appears from the context of the e-mail that 21 21 the headings, it says proposed Assembly districts. he's commenting on districts that the Wisconsin 22 22 And so I'm presuming that it relates to some Democracy Campaign created and posted on their 23 23 districts in the city of Madison, but beyond what website. 24 I can see, I don't know. 24 Q And had you referred at any time to the 25 Q So for example, you wouldn't know who proposed redistricting maps that the democracy campaign had 93 95 1 those Assembly districts? 1 developed? 2 A I don't. They appear to be the Act 43 districts. 2 A Can you --3 Q Do you know why Jamie Kuhn might have wanted you 3 MS. ARENDS: Objection to form. to see this? A I'm not quite sure what you mean by referred to or A Not recalling this e-mail and not seeing anything the time frame or to whom. 6 Q Okay. Let me try this, have you ever reviewed any that discusses it, I do not. 7 Q Let's turn to the end of that series right after 7 proposed maps drawn by the democracy campaign? the maps, okay. Do you see an e-mail from A I know that the democracy campaign came up with q Mike White? q their own redistricting map, and that I, you know, 10 10 A Yes. when they posted it, I looked at the map. I don't 11 Q It says Copied and saved v3 plan as v4; do I 11 recall that any analysis was done beyond kind of 12 understand that to mean version 3 and version 4? 12 generally looking at it, and I don't -- I guess it 13 13 A Yes, that's correct. does say that we had asked him for the shapefiles. 14 14 Q And what version of what would this be? Let me I don't even recall. Those would be the files 15 try this again. There are versions of something 15 that would actually allow analysis, and I can't 16 being made; what was being made here? 16 off the top of my head recall if we actually 17 17 A This references the plan mentioned earlier that received those or not. 18 18 Mike White and I worked on mainly over that Q Let's go another six pages. 19 weekend that I said was incomplete. And I believe 19 A Okay. 20 20 that version 4 is roughly where we left the map MS. ARENDS: Are we all on the 21 21 at. right page here? 22 22 Q What was the reason for having different versions? MR. KELLY: Not quite. 23 23 A The main reason is the redistricting software can Q All right. I'm looking at an e-mail from 24 be very buggy at times, and it's easy for the 24 Mike White to you dated July 10th, 2011.

25

A Okay.

25

whole thing to crash and lose the work you've

- Q And it says -- it starts at the top of the page, A Given that at that point the process was to and 2 so it will look a little bit like this. 2 the law was to create maps with ward boundaries 3 A This one. 3 that municipalities had created, I would say no. Q There you go. Q Also, in this e-mail, it says you are trying to A Just to confirm, the one that says subject, look at Fred's desires on the Green Bay area; do remapping? you see that? 7 Q Yes. 7 A Yes. A Okay. Q What were Fred's desires on the Green Bay area? Q Perfect. It mentions that you worked a lot on A I don't know specifically what the desires were. 10 10 western Wisconsin and northern Wisconsin; do you I think what we would have done was taken 11 11 see that? Representative Kessler's map and looked at what 12 A Yes. 12 work he had done in Green Bay and compare it to, 13 13 Q Why were you concentrating on those areas? you know, the work we had been working on. 14 14 A I don't know that there was a particular reason Q Do you know how they compared? 15 other than the goal was to create an entire A I don't recall exactly, no. 16 16 Q Do you recall how Mr. Kessler's map at that time state-wide Assembly redistricting plan, and you 17 know, in terms of working around the state, that 17 had compared to what the republicans had proposed? 18 was, at that point, just, you know, what I focused 18 A I have not reviewed his map for some time. 19 19 Q Do you have any general idea about what Fred 20 Q And you mentioned that you never did complete the 20 wanted in the Green Bay area? 21 21 A Not that I could -- not that I could describe map; is that right? 22 22 A I would not call the map complete, yes. right now, no. 23 23 Q What would you need to look at to be able to Q Why was it never completed? 24 A I would say it was not completed. I mean, from my describe that? 25 25 A At minimum, I would need to look at his map and own perspective, there was not time to complete 97 1 it. It takes, you know, a long time to, you know, 1 that may not really -- you know, that may not 2 2 I think come up with a good redistricting map, completely refresh me of his desires. I don't 3 3 more than just one weekend. The process was know that I could describe his desires without, moving quickly as far as the other maps that have been introduced passing, and given that, I don't 6 6 know that we could have completed it before the 7 7 were on the area. legislature acted. 8 Q Was there a reason that you were not able to start 8 q 9 working on the map earlier? 10 10 A The reason we didn't start working on the map 11 earlier is that the law provides for drawing, or 11 12 at that time, provides for drawing maps based upon 12 see that? 13 13 ward boundaries, which were not available at that A T do. 14 14 15 Q When you were drafting these versions of the map, 15 16 what was that based on?
 - you know, talking to him again because I just don't think I recall anymore what, you know, he was -- what he was drawing or what his thoughts Q Fair enough. It goes on and says Moved a lot of population to the Wausau area that needs to be straightened out and thought we needed to discuss Green Bay or GB and how to make that work; do you Q What needed to be straightened out? 16 17 were working on the idea of trying to create 18 districts that were -- you know, causes least 19 20 21 22 23 24 when I say moved population. And I think, you 25 100

99

that information.

A That was based upon the block -- the census

blocks, and at that point, you know, we went ahead

and worked on the map based upon the census blocks

given that, you know, the republican majority had

those, and we had no other choice but to work with

already introduced a plan that was based upon

Q Could you begin working on a map based on census

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

25

VIDEOTAPE DEPOSITION OF JOEL A. GRATZ 1/30/2012 straightened out, yeah, I think implies that we already --2 2 still had districts that needed to be, you know, A Yeah, I have no idea what his thoughts were when 3 brought into a reasonably small deviation for he wrote this. population in that area. Q Did you see anything in this e-mail that warranted 5 Q Were you eventually able to do that with that part it being confidential? of the map? 6 A I guess that would be his judgment if something 7 7 A I don't recall anymore since it has been a while ought to be confidential or not. since I've looked at the status of the map at the 8 Q Let's skip forward to a page that contains an end. e-mail from Rich Judge dated April 8th, 2011? 10 Q What about Green Bay did you need to discuss to 10 A April 8th, oh, yes. 11 11 Q Yes, that looks like it. make that work? 12 A Again, I have not looked at that map for, you A Okay. 13 know, six months or more, so I don't recall. 13 Q Let's go about halfway down the page there. Looks 14 14 Q Let's go two pages beyond that. like an e-mail from Doug Burnett dated April 3rd, 15 15 A Okay. 2011; do you see that? 16 16 Q And in the upper third of that page, there is an A T see that. 17 17 e-mail from Andy Gussert dated July 9th, 2011; do Q Do you know what that was about? 18 18 you see that? A It appears to be confirming or providing 19 19 information on a redistricting meeting. 20 Q Somehow or other, that eventually made its way to 20 Q Who was Doug Burnett? 21 you, yes? 21 A Doug Burnett works for the labor union AFSCME as 22 A Yes. 22 one of their lobbyists, among other things. 23 Q Who was Andy Gussert? 23 Q Do you understand this to be setting up a 24 A At the time of this e-mail, Andy Gussert was the conference call with AFSCME? 25 25 A It appears to be a meeting that also allows a director of the Assembly Democratic Campaign 101 103 1 Committee. 1 conference call, yes. 2 Q Do you know why he was sending you this e-mail? 2 Q Did you participate in that call? 3 A Given how the e-mail was addressed back to 3 A I -- I was invited to. I presume I did. I himself, I assume this was cc'd to a number of don't -- I have participated in meetings with people, and if it was a blind cc, as it appears to these individuals. I don't -- you know, could not 6 6 be, I don't know who all it went to. I think the 100 percent say it was this date, but I presume 7 purpose was to -- you know, it talks about which 7 districts there are pairings and open seats, and Q How many meetings would have you participated in q he was wanting to share that information with some q with individuals from AFSCME? 10 10 others. A In regards to redistricting? 11 Q Do you know why it would have been important for 11 Q Yes, thank you. 12 him to share that with you? 12 A I don't know an exact number. 13 13 Q More than five? A I don't know why that would have -- you know, I 14 14 A Unlikely. would have already had determined what those pairs 15 were. He may -- not knowing who all, my guess is 15 Q Somewhere between one and five? 16 he just sent this out to a large number of people. 16 A That would be my guess. I would not want to, you 17 17 know, be held to that. This may have been the I'm guessing. I guess I don't know what purpose. 18 18 Q Sure. It says in the last sentence of that first only one, or there may have been a couple 19 paragraph in his e-mail, "Please keep confidential 19 subsequent. 20 20 for time being, and do not post or forward Q Let's turn to the next page, and there's an e-mail 21 widely." 21 from you to Rich Judge and Cathy Friedl dated 22 22 A Uh-huh. March 22nd, 2011; do you see that? 23 Q Do you know why he wanted to keep that 23

104 26 of 43 sheets 2:11-cw/00f0:7-0787-PEWEROOR DINADIS/ONIGORAGE 2/6081839-0392ent 146 of 104 of 115

24

25

Q In the body of the -- this letter says, "Another thing about Fred. He needs to be reminded that it

24

25

confidential?

MS. ARENDS: Objection, he

1 would be best if no maps were drafted at this it-officially screwed." 2 2 time." Why would it best if no maps be drafted at A Okav. 3 that time? Q Do you have any idea what he meant by that? 4 A Well, I believe the rest of the e-mail describes 4 A Well, the item, again, going back to the item, the 5 that, which was that I -- you know, my personal item relate -- from Wheeler report relates to 6 6 opinion was that the legislature should get legal Assembly republicans hiring the firm of 7 7 Michael Best. It appears to not include, you advice on -- you know, before drawing maps 8 8 particularly that included Milwaukee, they should know, the opportunity for democrats to hire a get legal advice on how to properly take race into lawyer, and I think that's what it's referencing. 10 10 account given the current laws. Q Do you know if the democrats eventually ever did 11 11 Q Do you know if Fred had started drawing maps by hire an attorney to address redistricting matters? 12 12 that point? A I know that they were never permitted to hire a 13 13 A I have no idea when he drew his maps. lawyer through the legislature, and I don't 14 14 Q Just about done here. Let's go forward to a page believe they are, you know, represented themselves 15 that begins with an e-mail dated January 5th, 2011 15 at all in regards to redistricting that I know of. 16 from Scott Adrian. 16 Q Did they, to your knowledge, did they have anybody 17 MS. ARENDS: About how many pages? 17 working on, besides yourself, alternative maps? 18 18 A Not that I'm aware of, no. Well, outside of --THE WITNESS: Ouite a few. 19 MR. KELLY: Probably 25, 30 pages. 19 yeah, I mean, the work I did in conjunction with 20 A January 5th, you said? 20 Mike White, of course. 21 Q Correct. 21 Q Were you paid for that work? 22 A Okay. 22 A No, I was not. 23 23 Q Well, this is working much better than I thought Q Were you supposed to have been paid for that work? 24 it would. All right. Let's look at the e-mail, 24 A When -- there was never any understanding 25 25 regarding work drawing maps. The previous year it starts about in the middle of the page, from 105 107 1 Scott Adrian to you dated January 4th, 2011. 1 when I was working with Mike Sheridan and his 2 2 A Okay. staff when he was speaker, we had discussed that I 3 Q Okay. There is a -- at the last two lines on that 3 would, you know, be brought on as a consultant for 4 page, Mr. Adrian writes, "Why Barca made that them, but it never formally happened, and I was motion and not include Dems I have no idea." Do not paid, no. 6 6 Q All right. Let's put that exhibit to the side, you know what he meant by that? 7 A Well, I don't know exactly what he meant by that. 7 and we'll go back to the computer. And what I'd It appears to refer, immediately before that, like to do is just kind of get an understanding, a 9 9 which you did not read, was an item from the general understanding, we won't go through the 10 10 Wheeler report that describes the Assembly files in detail. I just want a general 11 committee taking some action and what took place 11 understanding of what's on there. So if you could 12 during that meeting, and that appears to reference 12 scoot that in my direction so that I might be able 13 13 that item. to look over your shoulder while not appearing in 14 14 Q Okay. What motion do you think he was referring the camera, that would be great. All right. So 15 15 to? let's start at the root directory for the CD. 16 16 A Well, I can only -- I can only read what the item A Okay. 17 17 from Wheeler report says. I can read it if you $\boldsymbol{\mathsf{Q}}$ And tell me generally what I'm seeing on this 18 18 wish me to. directory? 19 A Okay. The first directory is called Discovery Q That's all right. I just wanted to know if you 19 20 20 were aware of a particular motion that Mr. Barca Reply. Generally, this has a number of subfolders 21 had made? 21 within it. There's a folder, 2266; that was the 22 22 A I don't know of anything other than what's in that LRB draft number, as I recall, of the plans that 23 23 item that's from Wheeler report. eventually became Act 43. I believe that folder Q All right. The last sentence that begins on that 24 contains some of the Autobound files for those 25 25 page follows to the next page, "So there you have maps.

Q And those would have been provided to you by the map I worked on. Redistricting Plan Reports has 2 2 LRB or LTSB? two folders that contain reports on split 3 A Correct. There's a folder called AB 9, this 3 geography, population shifts within both the draft 4 folder appears to contain the redistricting maps plan that became Act 43 as well as, it appears, 5 that were in effect during the 2001 to 2011 time 5 Representative Kessler's plan. There's a folder, 6 frame. 6 Shapefile Revised. Looks like it's the final 7 7 Act 43 Autobound shapefile. There's the folder Q tih-huh. 8 A There's a folder Autobound Plan Exports. That 8 WAL Presentation Maps that we discussed here appears to be the most recent version of the plan earlier today. 10 10 that I had worked on with the legislature. And then there are a variety of files. Some 11 11 There's a folder Data, which appears to be of these are just large map printouts. Some of 12 12 duplicative of the 2266 folder. I think it's these are maps that Professor Mayer had asked me 13 13 those plans and data again. There's a folder to produce relating to districts in Milwaukee. 14 14 called Desktop, which has a variety of other plan There are summaries of the core population 15 15 files, again, more -- you know, just more copies retention within the districts. Yeah, so that is 16 really of 2266, the Senate Districts, the 16 all -- I think that's everything within, broadly, 17 Assembly Districts. 17 the folder that's called Discovery Reply on the 18 18 It looks like it has Representative Kessler's disk. 19 19 plan. It has an earlier version of the plan I had Q All right. What else do we have then outside of 20 worked on. It has some reports really into core 20 that folder? 21 constituency. It has a file showing the locations 21 A Outside of that, there's then the e-mails that 22 of incumbent legislators. It has some more 22 have been provided as a PDF, and there is also a 23 23 analysis that shows the pairings of file that's just called 0001 PDF, which is a scan 24 24 representatives. So it's items reviewing the plan of some handwritten notes that I had. 25 25 Q Are those your handwritten notes? that became Act 43. There's a folder called 109 1 A They are a combination of some of my writing as Discovery, which is documents that I have located 1 2 that were responsive to the subpoena. Within 2 well as some other writing. It's not all entirely 3 3 that, a folder of Assembly, redistricting work, mine. mostly the items we've talked about here. There's Q Who else's writing would be there besides yours? a folder GK Law Redistricting that is reports, the A The other writing that I recognize is Professor --6 analysis that I had prepared for the experts is I believe Professor Mayer's writing. 7 looking at compactness, looking at population 7 Q Can you identify which pages those appear on? 8 demographics of the districts. A The -- actually, if I could strike that, I believe q MS. ARENDS: Just to clarify, those 9 that the -- I don't know that I can tell you 100 10 10 are all discoverable. These are not percent whose writing is which. The first page 11 anything, not waiving anything. It's the 11 that I originally identified as Professor Mayer 12 12 title, just so you know. may actually have been Professor Nordheim's 13 13 A There's another folder, Ken Mayer Voces, which writing on page 1, and most all of what's on 14 14 shows some work I did for Professor Mayer in page 1 other than at the very bottom where it says 15 regards to Latino -- the work he did on Latino 15 year by year tracked is his writing, I believe. 16 16 districts in Milwaukee. There's a folder Other writing that isn't mine, on page 6, there 17 17 Miscellaneous. Again, this appears to be mainly are drawings and writing, and these are 18 18 Autobound files of redistricting plans, mainly the Professor Mayer's drawings and writing. Page 7 is 19 ones that were introduced. There's a file, 19 the same. And then it appears all other -- it 20 20 Peter Earle Requests From Ken, and this is data I appears all other handwriting is my own. 21 21 provided to Ken that he would have utilized in his Q Were you retained by Voces de la Frontera in this 22 22 reports. Plans is another folder. Again, case? 23 23 contains the plan introduced that became Act 43, A I was retained by -- by, you know, Peter Earle to

work with Professor Mayer, yes, and his clients.

 ${\bf 25} \quad {\bf Q}$ All right. If you'll give me just a few moments

24

25

the amendment to that plan. The congressional

plan that was approved, earlier versions of the

```
1
       off the record.
                                                                  employed by the parties hereto or financially
                                                               2
                                                                  interested in the action.
 2
                    THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
                                                               3
                                                                              In witness whereof I have hereunto set my
 3
           1:50. We are going off the record.
                                                                  hand and affixed my notarial seal this 3rd day of
 4
                (Recess taken)
                                                               5
                                                                  February 2012.
 5
                    THE VIDEOGRAPHER: The time is
 6
           1:54. We are back on the record.
                                                               7
7
                    MR. KELLY: All right. I have
                                                                                       Notary Public, State of Wisconsin
 8
           nothing further.
                                                               8
                                                                                       Registered Professional Reporter
 9
                    MS. LAZAR: That concludes the
                                                                  My commission expires
10
            deposition. Thank you for coming, Mr. Gratz.
                                                                  April 21, 2013
11
                    THE VIDEOGRAPHER: We are off the
                                                              10
12
           record. This concludes the video deposition
                                                              11
13
           of Mr. Joel Gratz. The time is 1:54.
                                                              12
14
                (Adjourning at 1:54 p.m.)
                                                              13
15
                                                              14
16
                                                              15
17
                                                              16
                                                              17
18
                                                              18
19
                                                              19
20
                                                              20
21
                                                              21
22
                                                              22
23
                                                              23
24
                                                              24
25
                                                              25
                           113
                                                                                         115
    STATE OF WISCONSIN )
                        ) ss.
 2 COUNTY OF DANE
```

```
3
      I, BRANDÉ A. BROWNE, a Registered Professional
    Reporter and Notary Public duly commissioned and
    qualified in and for the State of Wisconsin, do
    hereby certify that pursuant to subpoena and notice,
    there came before me on the 30th day of January 2012,
    at 9:11 in the forenoon, at the offices of
    Reinhart Boerner Van Deuren S.C., Attorneys at Law,
10
    22 East Mifflin Street, Suite 600, the City of
11
    Madison, County of Dane, and State of Wisconsin, the
12
    following named person, to wit: JOEL A. GRATZ, who
13
    was by me duly sworn to testify to the truth and
    nothing but the truth of his knowledge touching and
15
    concerning the matters in controversy in this cause;
16
    that he was thereupon carefully examined upon his
17
    oath and his examination reduced to typewriting with
18
    computer-aided transcription; that the deposition is
19
    a true record of the testimony given by the witness;
20
    and that reading and signing was not waived.
21
              I further certify that I am neither
22
    attorney or counsel for, nor related to or employed
    by any of the parties to the action in which this
    deposition is taken and further that I am not a
   relative or employee of any attorney or counsel
```

| | | | 1. 0.0.1.2 1/00/20 | <u> </u> |
|-------------------------------|---------------------------------|--|-----------------------------------|---------------------------------|
| 1 | 20 [2] - 33:16, 34:3 | 300 [1] - 4:23 | 9 | action [3] - 106:11, |
| | 2000 [9] - 20:10, | 30th [3] - 4:13, 6:5, | 9 | 114:23, 115:2 |
| | 22:20, 23:2, 23:9, | 114:7 | | Acts [1] - 17:1 |
| 'em [1] - 84:20 | 24:5, 24:15, 73:14, | 3rd [3] - 90:16, | 9 [3] - 3:12, 41:12, | |
| S[.] | 74:7, 74:9 | | 109:3 | actual [6] - 53:17, |
| 0 | · · | 103:14, 115:4 | 91 [1] - 3:17 | 53:19, 53:21, 53:22, |
| U | 2001 [5] - 23:10, | 4 | | 59:5, 78:11 |
| | 27:13, 30:23, 74:11, | 4 | 9:11 [3] - 4:14, 6:6, | added [1] - 41:5 |
| 0001 [1] - 111:23 | 109:5 | | 114:8 | addition [1] - 21:4 |
| | 2002 [2] - 23:10, | 4 (2) 04:42 04:20 | 9th [2] - 54:24, | additional [2] - 21:6, |
| 1 | 74:11 | 4 _[2] - 94:12, 94:20 | 101:17 | 43:6 |
| • | 2003 [1] - 18:15 | 40 [1] - 34:8 | | address [2] - 42:14, |
| | 2005 [2] - 20:24, | 417 [1] - 5:10 | A | 107:11 |
| 1 [4] - 5:18, 90:19, | 74:14 | 43 [28] - 13:5, 13:7, | | addressed [1] - |
| 112:13, 112:14 | 2007 [1] - 74:18 | 13:25, 14:2, 14:9, | · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · | 102:3 |
| 1/5/2010 [1] - 78:20 | 2009 [1] - 74:18 | 17:1, 28:3, 29:7, | a.m [1] - 6:6 | Adjourning [1] - |
| 10 [1] - 31:14 | 2010 [9] - 23:2, 23:8, | 29:15, 29:22, 30:5, | AB [1] - 109:3 | 113:14 |
| 100 [2] - 104:6, 112:9 | 32:19, 44:8, 58:25, | 32:5, 41:7, 59:12, | ability [6] - 65:21, | adopted [2] - 16:7, |
| | 79:6, 79:22, 80:13, | 60:11, 62:4, 62:5, | 66:17, 67:14, 67:24, | 16:11 |
| 1000 [1] - 5:6 | 80:21 | 62:8, 62:23, 67:22, | 68:3, 72:11 | |
| 1026 [4] - 3:11, 5:13, | | 84:3, 85:11, 94:2, | able [11] - 27:22, | adoption [2] - 65:25, |
| 8:6, 8:18 | 2011 [52] - 10:10, | 108:23, 109:25, | 63:13, 65:16, 66:21, | 67:6 |
| 1027 [5] - 3:12, 5:13, | 12:3, 16:12, 16:24, | 110:23, 111:4, 111:7 | 77:18, 88:5, 89:1, | Adrian [9] - 3:16, |
| 9:9, 50:16, 56:14 | 27:13, 30:17, 31:22, | 44 [9] - 14:3, 14:10, | 98:8, 99:23, 101:5, | 11:17, 11:18, 85:22, |
| 1028 [7] - 3:13, 57:7, | 32:5, 32:10, 32:21, | 17:1, 28:3, 29:7, | 108:12 | 87:1, 87:6, 105:16, |
| 57:16, 60:3, 73:8, | 37:14, 37:16, 43:1, | 29:16, 29:23, 30:5, | absolutely [1] - | 106:1, 106:4 |
| 74:1, 74:22 | 43:8, 43:16, 43:23, | 32:5 | 42:12 | advantage [2] - 89:7, |
| 1029 [3] - 3:14, 76:1, | 44:20, 45:9, 45:24, | | accelerate [1] - 89:1 | 89:8 |
| 76:21 | 46:5, 46:23, 47:3, | 447-2199 [1] - 5:11 | | advantages [3] - |
| 1030 [2] - 3:15, 78:22 | 47:14, 48:5, 49:3, | 4th [1] - 106:1 | acceptable [2] - | 86:21, 88:13, 88:16 |
| 1031 [4] - 3:16, 57:7, | 49:6, 50:11, 51:19, | _ | 7:22, 15:17 | advice [4] - 49:1, |
| 85:20, 86:10 | 51:24, 51:25, 52:2, | 5 | accepted [1] - 40:23 | 80:16, 105:7, 105:9 |
| 1032 [3] - 3:17, | 55:1, 55:16, 57:24, | | access [8] - 28:25, | advised [1] - 50:2 |
| 90:22, 91:4 | 58:23, 58:24, 59:11, | F00 4.00 | 37:8, 40:7, 40:9, | advocate [1] - 77:19 |
| | 59:15, 81:11, 81:13, | 500 [1] - 4:20 | 42:10, 51:8, 56:15, | affects [1] - 64:17 |
| 10:05 [1] - 49:20 | 89:2, 89:22, 93:3, | 53021 [1] - 5:10 | 73:20 | |
| 10th [1] - 96:24 | 95:11, 96:24, 101:17, | 53202 [2] - 4:24, 5:7 | accessing [1] - 22:1 | affidavits [1] - 30:24 |
| 11-CV-1011 [1] - | 103:9, 103:15, | 53703 [2] - 4:20, 5:3 | According [1] - | affiliated [1] - 19:13 |
| 2:11 | 104:22, 105:15, | 57 [2] - 3:5, 3:13 | 46:21 | affirmation [1] - |
| 11-CV-562 [2] - 1:12, | 104.22, 103.13, | 5th [2] - 105:15, | account [1] - 105:10 | 46:18 |
| 6:1 | | 105:20 | accountability [1] - | affixed [1] - 115:4 |
| 11:51 [1] - 49:23 | 2012 [6] - 1:20, 4:14, | | 48:3 | African [1] - 41:6 |
| 12:12 [1] - 61:7 | 6:5, 43:10, 114:7, | 6 | Accountability [25] - | African-American |
| 12:20 [1] - 61:10 | 115:5 | | 1:14, 2:2, 2:13, 2:16, | [1] - 41:6 |
| 12:40 [1] - 75:21 | 2013 [1] - 115:9 | | 4:5, 5:22, 6:19, 43:16, | AFSCME [4] - 51:17, |
| 12:43 [1] - 75:24 | 21 [1] - 115:9 | 6 [1] - 112:16 | | 103:21, 103:24, 104:9 |
| 12th [1] - 95:11 | 2100 [1] - 5:7 | 600 [2] - 4:12, 114:10 | 43:23, 44:7, 44:9, | afternoon [1] - 16:9 |
| 13th [2] - 55:16, 93:3 | 22 [3] - 4:12, 6:4, | | 44:12, 44:19, 44:23, | age [1] - 4:2 |
| 13th [2] - 55.16, 95.3 | 114:10 | 7 | 45:8, 45:16, 45:22, | ago [2] - 21:16, |
| | 2266 [3] - 108:21, | - | 45:25, 46:5, 46:23, | 58:19 |
| 17 [1] - 5:3 | 109:12, 109:16 | | 47:14, 48:4, 48:12, | |
| 1990s [1] - 73:19 | 22nd [1] - 104:22 | 7 [2] - 3:4, 112:18 | 49:5, 49:9 | agreed [2] - 23:3, |
| 1995 [1] - 19:21 | 25 [4] - 33:16, 34:3, | 76 [1] - 3:14 | act [27] - 13:5, 13:7, | 83:5 |
| 1:05 [1] - 90:18 | 34:8, 105:19 | 79 [1] - 3:15 | 14:2, 14:3, 14:9, | agreement [2] - |
| 1:17 [1] - 90:25 | 26 [4] - 45:5, 45:7, | 7th [1] - 54:23 | 14:10, 28:3, 29:7, | 23:18, 24:25 |
| 1:50 [1] - 113:3 | | | 29:15, 30:5, 32:5, | ahead [2] - 78:17, |
| 1:54 [3] - 113:6, | 48:17, 48:19 | 8 | 41:7, 59:12, 60:11, | 98:18 |
| 113:13, 113:14 | 262 [1] - 5:11 | U | 62:4, 62:5, 62:8, | aided [1] - 114:18 |
| , | | - | 62:23, 67:22, 84:3, | al [6] - 4:3, 4:5, 4:21, |
| 2 | 3 | 8 [2] - 3:11, 41:12 | 85:11, 94:2, 108:23, | 4:25, 5:21, 5:23 |
| _ | | 839 [1] - 4:23 | 109:25, 110:23, | allocated [1] - 77:12 |
| | 2111 04:40 | 85 [1] - 3:16 | 111:4, 111:7 | allow [3] - 13:17, |
| 2 [2] - 88:20, 91:1 | 3 [1] - 94:12 | | Act [2] - 13:25, 29:22 | 86:17, 96:15 |
| 2/26/2010 [1] - 86:7 | 30 [2] - 1:20, 105:19 | 8th [2] - 103:9, | | allowed [1] - 67:21 |
| | | 103:10 | acted [1] - 98:7 | anoweu [1] - 07.21 |
| | | <u> </u> | | 1 |

2:15 allows [2] - 45:7, areas [5] - 62:20, 91:10, 102:4 103:25 64:9, 64:13, 68:20, assumes [1] - 47:24 based [12] - 44:22, almost [1] - 49:14 97:13 attached [3] - 3:20, 48:17, 64:8, 80:2, 87:17, 88:6, 98:12, alternative [3] - 16:2, ARENDS [36] - 4:19, 93:14, 93:17 98:16, 98:17, 98:19, 6:12, 9:24, 10:24, 60:21, 107:17 attend [3] - 44:3, 11:6, 29:24, 34:15, 98:21, 98:24 **Alvin** [3] - 4:3, 4:21, 49:11, 51:18 40:11, 42:25, 44:14, basic [1] - 7:12 attended [5] - 24:8, 5:21 44:21, 45:13, 45:18, 34:1, 43:4, 74:24, basing [2] - 87:20, **ALVIN** [1] - 1:3 80:24 45:21, 46:7, 47:23, 88:14 amended [1] - 13:2 amendment [5] -48:25, 57:11, 60:8, attendees [4] - 35:8, **Bay** [8] - 62:2, 66:12, 60:17, 60:20, 60:23, 72:17, 79:4, 79:10 99:5, 99:8, 99:12, 13:7, 14:1, 14:2, 14:9, 61:4, 66:23, 67:18, 99:20, 100:11, 101:10 110:24 attending [5] - 22:18, 70:18, 70:25, 71:11, 25:6, 34:9, 51:23, became [8] - 14:3, **American** [1] - 41:6 83:21, 88:8, 90:8, 62:4, 84:3, 85:11, 52:3 amicus [1] - 14:23 96:3, 96:20, 102:25, attorney [3] - 107:11, 108:23, 109:25, **AMY** [1] - 1:7 105:17, 110:9 110:23, 111:4 analysis [17] - 9:5, 114:22, 114:25 **Arends** [1] - 6:12 **BECHEN** [1] - 1:3 10:16, 23:5, 23:22, Attorney [7] - 3:25, arguing [1] - 48:20 become [1] - 66:11 4:19, 4:22, 5:2, 5:5, 25:7, 26:22, 27:15, argumentive [1] -6:17, 33:20 becomes [1] - 51:7 27:16, 29:1, 29:3, 48:15 becoming [1] - 48:14 Attorneys [5] - 4:11, 67:2, 67:23, 73:17, articles [1] - 31:6 96:11, 96:15, 109:23, 4:19, 4:23, 5:6, 114:9 beforehand [1] aspect [4] - 18:19, 110:6 attorneys [2] - 10:4, 36:19 64:21, 65:9, 65:18 23:4 analyst [1] - 21:24 began [4] - 22:14, aspects [2] - 24:11, **Andy** [3] - 101:17, audience [1] - 35:8 22:16, 73:13, 74:16 24:12 101:23, 101:24 August [4] - 32:21, begin [2] - 91:12, assembling [1] answer [19] - 7:14, 58:23, 58:24, 58:25 98:24 authority [1] - 51:11 7:22, 13:12, 13:14, **beginning** [1] - 91:1 Assembly [34] -27:22, 30:3, 32:15, begins [2] - 105:15, auto [1] - 78:9 14:13, 14:14, 15:7, 37:23, 40:5, 44:17, 106:24 Autobound [13] -15:8, 15:9, 15:23, 44:18, 45:12, 45:20, 12:19, 12:21, 12:22, behalf [12] - 4:2, 17:2, 20:3, 21:7, 48:16, 48:23, 56:7, 24:16, 24:17, 35:17, 4:20, 4:24, 5:4, 5:7, 21:20, 22:11, 23:17, 56:10, 68:11 42:4, 42:10, 55:11, 17:9, 45:9, 45:17, answers [2] - 13:17, 26:1, 26:5, 26:6, 46:1, 48:9, 53:16, 108:24, 109:8, 41:12, 61:24, 62:3, 13:18 110:18, 111:7 54:6 62:16, 62:18, 62:20, apologize [7] available [5] - 16:2, beholder [1] - 15:14 62:21, 62:24, 76:8, 29:21, 52:24, 53:11, 11:11, 12:20, 23:8, **BELL** [1] - 1:7 81:12, 83:14, 93:21, 23:12, 28:21, 30:13, 98:13 below [1] - 95:15 94:1, 97:16, 101:25, 73:10 aware [4] - 47:25, beneficial [1] - 89:12 106:10, 107:6, appear [3] - 41:24, 85:17, 106:20, 107:18 benefit [3] - 47:19, 109:17, 110:3 94:2, 112:7 71:21, 71:25 assist [4] - 21:25, В appeared [1] - 30:22 Best [1] - 107:7 38:23, 54:14, 82:22 appearing [6] - 4:20, best [4] - 50:12, assistance [7] -4:24, 5:4, 5:7, 71:25, 66:3, 105:1, 105:2 background [3] -10:15, 18:2, 38:17, 108:13 better [4] - 68:22, 18:8, 73:10, 73:24 74:21, 74:23, 85:15 Appleton [1] - 62:2 92:3, 92:4, 105:23 bad [1] - 95:2 **Assistant** [1] - 5:2 approached [1] between [7] - 8:25, **balance** [1] - 65:24 assistant [1] - 6:17 70:5 9:16, 10:3, 11:10, **BALDUS** [1] - 1:3 assisted [2] - 38:10, appropriateness [1] 47:13, 70:6, 104:15 **Baldus** [3] - 4:3, 38:11 - 70:11 beyond [8] - 19:17, 4:21, 5:21 associated [1] - 36:1 **approve** [1] - 51:13 52:16, 52:17, 83:2, **BALDWIN** [1] - 1:10 Association [12] -93:23, 95:10, 96:11, approved [2] - 33:8, **ban** [1] - 28:13 32:22, 59:6, 59:14, 110:25 101:14 **BARBERA** [1] - 1:3 61:13, 63:6, 64:1, approximate [1] -**BIENDSEIL** [1] - 1:3 Barca [10] - 3:14, 67:3, 68:8, 68:13, 12:2 **big** [1] - 22:10 68:25, 69:15, 71:23 11:24, 12:11, 28:17, **April** [4] - 103:9, biggest [1] - 64:21 76:4, 78:1, 78:20, association [8] -103:10, 103:14, 115:9 Bill [2] - 93:7, 93:10 81:21, 106:4, 106:20 17:15, 17:16, 17:18, area [11] - 34:7, 62:1, **bill** [1] - 86:13 Barca's [2] - 52:14, 17:22, 33:1, 58:15, 62:2, 65:19, 99:5, bills [3] - 52:7, 52:23, 81:16 58:17, 59:11 99:8, 99:20, 100:7, **BARLAND** [2] - 1:16, assume [3] - 7:21, 100:9, 100:25, 101:4 Bureau [1] - 36:23 **bipartisan** [1] - 51:14

bit [7] - 16:21, 17:14, 60:9, 67:11, 73:20, 85:3, 97:2 blind [1] - 102:5 **block** [2] - 56:7, 98:17 **blocks** [10] - 86:1, 86:17, 87:17, 87:21, 88:6, 88:14, 89:3, 98:18, 98:19, 98:25 Board [24] - 1:14, 2:2, 2:13, 2:16, 4:5, 5:22, 6:19, 43:16, 43:23, 44:7, 44:12, 44:19, 44:24, 45:8, 45:16, 45:23, 45:25, 46:5, 46:23, 47:14, 48:4, 48:12, 49:5, 49.9 board [2] - 44:4, 48:4 body [2] - 92:22, 104:24 Boerner [4] - 4:11, 6:3, 6:23, 114:9 **BOERNER** [1] - 5:6 **BOONE** [2] - 1:4 bottom [5] - 77:7, 78:25, 91:13, 92:7, 112:14 boundaries [9] -14:10, 14:11, 15:6, 15:7, 15:8, 86:18, 98:13, 99:2, 100:23 **boundary** [1] - 40:2 **BRANDÉ** [1] - 114:3 Brandé [3] - 1:21, 4:8, 6:8 break [5] - 7:24, 49:14, 49:25, 50:2, 67:11 BRENNAN [2] - 1:15, 2:14 BRETT [1] - 1:5 brief [1] - 20:19 bring [2] - 61:1, 75:16 broadly [6] - 18:10, 19:23, 25:19, 34:8, 74:18, 111:16 brought [4] - 26:10, 86:14, 101:3, 108:3 **BROWNE** [1] - 114:3 Browne [4] - 1:21, 4:8, 6:8, 11:25 Budget [1] - 20:15 budget [3] - 24:20, 25:2, 25:4 buggy [1] - 94:24 **BUMPUS** [1] - 1:4

bureau [2] - 37:4, 86:15 Burnett [3] - 103:14, 103:20, 103:21 business [8] - 18:13, 20:1, 21:1, 21:4, 21:13, 38:3, 50:1, 71:22

C

calendar [2] - 16:13, 16:18 camera [1] - 108:14 campaign [7] -18:11, 20:21, 38:6, 65:22, 95:25, 96:7, 96:8 Campaign [6] -20:21, 21:7, 25:10, 26:1, 95:22, 101:25 campaigns [6] -18:21, 18:23, 18:25, 19:2, 26:4, 26:7 Campbell [4] - 5:9, 5:9, 6:6, 6:7 candidates [1] - 26:5 **CANE** [2] - 1:15, 2:14 capacity [3] - 1:14, 2:13, 6:21 Capitol [4] - 36:3, 36:6, 39:7, 39:8 Caption [1] - 1:17 care [1] - 49:25 career [1] - 18:9 carefully [1] - 114:16 **CARLENE** [1] - 1:3 case [10] - 14:22, 23:23, 23:24, 31:2, 32:15, 46:3, 50:24, 54:6, 77:16, 112:22 Case [2] - 2:11, 6:1 cases [1] - 63:16 category [1] - 9:19 Cathy [1] - 104:21 Caucus [5] - 20:3, 20:10, 20:11, 21:21, 22:8 caucus [7] - 20:4, 21:23, 21:24, 22:9, 22:11, 24:23, 25:4 caucuses [1] - 24:25 caught [1] - 92:21 causes [1] - 100:18 cc [1] - 102:5 cc'd [1] - 102:4 **CD** [23] - 3:12, 8:18, 8:19, 8:20, 14:8, 26:10, 27:23, 34:14,

34:17, 41:9, 42:9, 50:15, 56:13, 56:16, 59:16, 61:15, 78:12, 82:6, 86:4, 86:6, 91:5, 91:11, 108:15 ceased [2] - 81:9, 81:10 **CECELIA** [1] - 1:7 census [23] - 22:20, 23:2, 37:1, 44:6, 44:8, 44:10, 52:24, 53:10, 58:9, 73:13, 74:7, 74:9, 85:25, 86:17, 87:17, 87:21, 88:6, 88:14, 89:1, 98:17, 98:19, 98:24, 100:22 center [2] - 18:21, 19:7 Central [1] - 62:24 certain [10] - 19:8, 30:12, 49:10, 53:5, 54:1, 54:23, 60:5, 85:13, 87:7, 92:19 certainly [3] - 72:19, 74:24, 88:10 certify [2] - 114:6, 114:21 Chairman [1] - 52:11 challenge [1] - 77:20 challenger [1] -65:20 chance [1] - 71:15 change [1] - 50:7 changed [1] - 21:16 changes [2] - 29:4, 86:16 characterize [3] -35:5, 78:25, 83:1 **charts** [1] - 82:9 choice [1] - 98:22 choose [1] - 63:9 chose [2] - 16:1, 63:10 **CINDY** [1] - 1:3 **City** [3] - 4:12, 93:7, 114:10 city [2] - 93:17, 93:23 Claire [1] - 66:13 **CLARENCE** [1] - 1:5 **clarify** [3] - 7:19, 87:19, 110:9 clear [1] - 93:16 CLEEREMAN [1] clicked [1] - 61:22 client [7] - 10:22, 10:25, 11:1, 11:3, 11:6, 17:10, 45:9

clients [3] - 19:9,

19:10, 112:24

clip [1] - 13:12 clipping [1] - 13:17 close [1] - 100:19 closer [1] - 91:18 CLVS [1] - 5:9 **COCHRAN** [1] - 1:4 coffee [1] - 8:1 colleague [1] - 78:6 **collection** [1] - 63:1 college [2] - 19:25, 73:19 combination [1] -112:1 coming [3] - 38:20, 113:10 commencing [1] -4:14 commented [1] -69:23 commenting [2] -95:19, 95:21 commission [1] -115:9 commissioned [1] -114:4 committee [3] -50:24, 51:17, 106:11 Committee [11] -20:22, 21:8, 25:11, 26:1, 32:1, 32:9, 32:11, 32:14, 32:17, 92:11, 102:1 communicate [3] -31:25, 32:8, 32:16 communicated [2] -11:14, 81:1 communicating [2] -11:19, 86:25 communication [3] -8:24, 46:4, 47:12 communications [2] - 9:16, 11:17 communities [1] -40:22 compact [1] - 40:21 compactness [1] -110:7 Company [2] - 5:9, company [2] - 18:12, 21:10 compare [4] - 42:5, 83:18, 85:11, 99:12 compared [5] -83:15, 83:17, 84:1, 99:14, 99:17 comparing [1] -

complete [9] - 13:12, 13:18, 13:19, 41:1, 68:18, 85:9, 97:20, 97:22, 97:25 completed [4] - 89:4, 97:23, 97:24, 98:6 completely [2] -11:15, 100:2 completion [1] -15:13 comprehensive [1] -73:7 computer [13] -28:25, 50:17, 51:5, 56:15, 60:14, 60:15, 61:3, 61:20, 75:14, 75:19, 83:7, 108:7, 114:18 computer-aided [1] -114:18 computers [2] -37:3, 37:5 concentrating [1] -97:13 concepts [2] - 22:17, 25:21 concerned [1] -70:16 concerning [1] -114:15 conclude [3] - 21:3, 67:4, 71:3 concludes [3] - 14:7, 113:9, 113:12 concluding [1] -90:19 conclusion [1] -87:18 conclusions [1] -87:15 conduct [2] - 18:22, 72:2 Conference [2] -24:9, 75:13 conference [10] -33:10, 33:24, 34:4, 34:5, 36:1, 40:9, 51:17, 83:8, 103:24, 104:1 conferences [6] -22:18, 24:5, 24:9, 25:7, 74:24, 75:12 Confidential [1] -87:8 confidential [6] -87:9, 87:13, 102:19, 102:24, 103:5, 103:7 confirm [2] - 75:5, 97:5

confirming [1] -

103:18 conform [1] - 40:24 confused [1] - 83:24 Congress [2] -32:12, 32:17 congressional [9] -14:3, 14:11, 14:18, 15:6, 40:2, 54:6, 54:10, 86:19, 110:24 Congressman [3] -42:24, 43:7, 43:13 conjunction [1] -107:19 connect [1] - 72:4 consider [2] - 15:20, consideration [1] -88:25 considering [2] -74:11, 87:20 consist [1] - 26:24 consists [1] - 50:25 constituency [1] -109:21 constituents [2] -22:2, 22:13 constituted [1] -92:14 consultant [4] - 11:8, 44:16, 44:25, 108:3 consultation [2] -80:17, 81:8 consulting [4] -18:10, 18:24, 38:5, 77:5 Consulting [8] -37:9, 37:11, 37:24, 38:1, 38:8, 38:15, 38:22, 39:9 contact [13] - 22:2, 31:23, 38:4, 44:1, 45:8, 45:22, 45:24, 46:22, 47:3, 48:7, 48:11, 49:4, 49:11 contacted [8] -12:10, 43:15, 43:20, 43:22, 44:19, 44:23, 45:16, 48:3 contacting [1] - 46:1 **contacts** [1] - 49:8 contain [2] - 109:4, 111:2 contains [3] - 103:8, 108:24, 110:23 content [1] - 80:22 contents [2] - 61:19, 82:24 context [1] - 95:20 contiguous [1] -40:21

compiled [2] - 42:20,

74:3

continue [5] - 12:23, 64:19, 65:16, 80:16 Continued [2] - 1:17, 5:1 continued [1] - 81:10 continuing [3] -13:14, 13:24, 65:25 **controlled** [1] - 90:7 controversy [1] -114:15 conversation [1] -72:20 conversations [6] -76:11, 76:14, 76:18, 79:21, 80:23, 81:17 conversing [1] -81:13 Copied [1] - 94:11 copies [4] - 3:20, 31:20, 40:4, 109:15 copy [7] - 10:20, 12:21, 12:22, 59:13, 83:3, 83:6, 91:10 core [4] - 42:14, 82:10, 109:20, 111:14 corporation [1] -18:16 correct [62] - 8:3, 8:9, 9:10, 10:5, 11:2, 11:5, 12:5, 12:13, 13:6, 13:8, 15:5, 21:3, 21:22, 22:6, 22:21, 24:6, 25:8, 25:12, 25:17, 26:2, 26:20, 26:23, 27:17, 29:8, 30:6, 30:18, 31:5, 32:20, 35:19, 35:22, 36:4, 36:7, 36:10, 40:3, 41:10, 46:6, 46:16, 46:24, 50:11, 54:7, 54:11, 56:16, 56:17, 61:17, 61:18, 64:10, 64:11, 67:13, 69:10, 75:8, 80:15, 84:3, 84:4, 84:7, 88:15, 88:22, 92:9, 93:1, 94:13, 95:14, 105:21, 109:3 counsel [18] - 3:20, 6:9, 6:20, 8:12, 46:3, 46:18, 47:11, 48:15, 48:18, 49:1, 49:15, 50:3, 53:3, 80:6, 81:5, 91:6, 114:22, 114:25 Counsel [2] - 2:1, counsel's [1] - 46:21 counter [2] - 29:22, 30:3 **COUNTY** [1] - 114:2

County [2] - 4:13, 114:11 couple [1] - 104:18 course [4] - 31:13, 39:17, 39:20, 107:20 court [7] - 6:8, 6:25, 7:15, 23:19, 30:23, 31:1, 50:5 Court [2] - 4:6, 5:24 COURT [1] - 1:1 cover [1] - 63:1 covers [3] - 9:6, 27:15, 63:3 crash [1] - 94:25 create [7] - 40:20, 40:21, 69:12, 80:10, 97:15, 99:2, 100:17 created [6] - 53:12, 66:17, 69:7, 74:19, 95:22, 99:3 creates [1] - 12:19 creating [1] - 85:15 credibility [1] - 72:13 criteria [5] - 38:21, 40:16, 40:18, 40:24, 75:7 CRR [1] - 1:21 curious [1] - 83:15 current [6] - 86:16, 89:4, 89:12, 90:11,

D

90:12, 105:10

Dan [2] - 57:1, 91:14 **DANE** [1] - 114:2 Dane [3] - 4:13, 62:24, 114:11 **DANIEL** [1] - 5:5 **Daniel** [1] - 6:22 Data [1] - 109:11 data [17] - 18:24, 22:13, 23:22, 25:7, 36:25, 43:7, 44:1, 44:3, 44:6, 44:10, 44:12, 52:24, 53:10, 89:2, 109:13, 110:20 date [21] - 6:5, 12:4, 16:9, 16:14, 20:12, 23:16, 53:10, 53:11, 78:6, 78:7, 78:8, 78:10, 78:11, 78:12, 78:21, 86:2, 86:5, 86:6, 86:8, 104:6 dated [8] - 55:15, 96:24, 101:17, 103:9, 103:14, 104:21, 105:15, 106:1 dates [7] - 16:19,

17:6, 53:10, 54:18, 54:23, 54:25, 55:4 **DAVID** [2] - 1:15, 2:14 David [1] - 42:24 **DAVIS** [1] - 1:5 days [7] - 39:14, 39:20, 39:21, 39:23, 89:25, 90:4, 90:13 De [1] - 4:25 de [1] - 112:21 **DE**[1] - 2:8 deal [1] - 92:17 debate [1] - 68:5 debates [2] - 67:17, 67:21 decade [2] - 74:13, 74:17 December [3] -54:23, 54:24, 55:16 decided [1] - 69:19 decidedly [2] - 71:2, 71:3 Decker [2] - 20:23, 25:16 declaration [1] -46:14 deemed [1] - 28:4 defective [1] - 61:2 **Defendants** [6] - 2:3, 2:6, 2:17, 4:5, 5:4, 5:7 defendants [1] - 5:20 degree [2] - 19:16, 19:18 degrees [1] - 19:14 **DEININGER** [2] -1:15, 2:14 **delay** [1] - 60:9 delayed [2] - 41:14, Democracy [1] -

41:22 95:22 democracy [3] -95:25, 96:7, 96:8 democrat [3] - 80:17, 81:8, 90:2 democratic [24] -11:3, 22:9, 23:25, 24:2, 30:10, 31:23, 31:25, 32:11, 36:20, 66:12, 66:14, 67:4, 71:20, 84:6, 84:12, 84:14, 84:18, 85:5, 85:10, 85:14, 85:18, 90:12, 90:15, 95:5 Democratic [19] -20:3, 20:9, 20:11, 20:21, 21:7, 21:20, 22:7, 25:10, 26:1, 32:1, 32:9, 32:13,

32:16, 36:2, 36:5, 52:1, 52:4, 52:10, 101:25 democrats [23] -19:11, 30:15, 34:23, 35:9, 35:13, 53:16, 53:25, 54:7, 54:10, 66:6, 66:18, 66:20, 67:23, 73:15, 76:7, 77:15, 81:12, 83:20, 89:23, 90:1, 90:7, 107:8, 107:10 demographics [3] -27:7, 82:11, 110:8 demonstrating [1] -68:14 **Dems** [1] - 106:5 depart [2] - 89:5, 89:13 **DEPARTMENT**[1] -5:3 deponent [1] - 47:16 **Deposition** [1] - 3:11 **DEPOSITION** [2] -1:18. 4:1 deposition [13] -3:24, 5:18, 6:1, 7:10, 8:3, 8:8, 30:22, 90:19, 91:1, 113:10, 113:12, 114:18, 114:24 describe [5] - 14:11, 14:15, 99:21, 99:24, 100:3 described [1] - 62:16 describes [4] -10:17, 57:18, 105:4, 106:10 describing [2] - 76:4, 100:15 Description [1] -3:10 designees [1] -50:25 desires [5] - 99:5, 99:8, 99:9, 100:2, 100:3 **Desktop** [1] - 109:14 detail [2] - 14:16, 108:10 details [1] - 69:19 determination [1] -84:22 **determine** [1] - 86:4 determined [1] -102:14

DEUREN [1] - 5:6

Deuren [4] - 4:11,

develop [1] - 88:5

developed [2] -

6:3, 6:23, 114:9

83:20, 96:1 developing [1] -87:24 development [1] deviation [2] - 42:13, 101:3 deviations [2] -15:17, 40:19 different [11] - 23:17, 27:7, 30:5, 58:6, 58:13, 59:7, 63:10, 69:17, 70:9, 81:11, 94:22 difficult [2] - 66:5, 68:7 direct [2] - 74:23 directed [2] - 12:7, 61:15 direction [3] - 70:24, 80:6, 108:12 directly [2] - 28:20, 36:17 director [4] - 6:20, 21:7, 25:25, 101:25 Director [2] - 2:1, 2:15 directory [3] -108:15, 108:18, 108:19 disadvantage [1] disadvantages [2] -68:6, 86:21 disagreement [1] -48:18 **discipline** [1] - 61:1 discoverable [3] -45:14, 45:17, 110:10 Discovery [4] -59:22, 108:19, 110:1, 111:17 discuss [7] - 29:20, 51:2, 51:4, 55:3, 77:10, 100:10, 101:10 discussed [9] -38:19, 53:5, 53:16, 53:17, 53:20, 82:8, 88:2, 108:2, 111:8 discusses [4] -85:24, 89:9, 89:15, 94:6 discussing [3] -28:18, 28:22, 87:12 **Discussion** [1] - 3:15 discussion [10] -28:10, 36:13, 36:15, 53:1, 53:14, 53:21, 53:22, 53:24, 79:2, 79:7

discussions [5] -15:23, 15:25, 76:24, 78:1, 80:2 disenfranchised [1] - 70:15 disenfranchisemen **t** [2] - 41:15, 71:6 disenfranchising [1] - 63:24 Disk [2] - 90:19, 91:1 disk [2] - 29:3, 111:18 disruption [1] -100:19 dissimilarity [1] -70:5 dissolved [1] - 20:12 **District** [4] - 4:6, 4:7, 5:24, 5:25 district [17] - 15:10, 27:3, 39:2, 41:6, 42:7, 42:15, 42:17, 65:13, 65:17, 71:19, 71:20, 82:12, 87:16, 87:21, 88:6, 88:14 **DISTRICT** [2] - 1:1, 1:1 Districts [2] -109:16, 109:17 districts [48] - 14:13, 14:14, 14:15, 15:10, 15:11, 15:18, 27:13, 27:14, 34:21, 35:1, 40:20, 40:21, 41:2, 41:6, 41:11, 42:5, 59:9, 59:12, 62:3, 62:20, 62:23, 64:20, 66:11, 66:13, 66:19, 68:21, 71:14, 71:17, 82:11, 85:25, 88:18, 93:21, 93:23, 94:1, 94:2, 95:17, 95:19, 95:21, 100:18, 100:21, 101:2, 102:8, 110:8, 110:16, 111:13, 111:15 document [7] - 8:6, 56:13, 57:24, 59:17, 74:20, 79:14, 90:9 documents [11] -8:14, 9:4, 9:20, 10:6, 11:9, 18:6, 26:21, 34:11, 76:1, 91:8, 110:1 done [12] - 15:4, 29:15, 39:3, 42:6, 72:19, 81:2, 88:3, 95:1, 96:11, 99:10, 99:12, 105:14 doubt [1] - 37:17

Doug [3] - 103:14, 103:20, 103:21 **Doug's** [1] - 44:22 down [4] - 67:11, 77:7, 91:12, 103:13 downsizing [1] -25:4 dozen [1] - 19:6 **DPW**[1] - 2:12 draft [10] - 9:3, 29:21, 29:22, 30:4, 51:6, 55:21, 56:8, 86:13, 108:22, 111:3 **Draft** [1] - 87:8 drafted [5] - 56:5, 68:25, 87:14, 105:1, 105:2 drafting [1] - 98:15 drafts [2] - 26:12, 26:19 draw [5] - 15:22, 16:3, 82:16, 90:10, 100:16 drawing [19] - 9:2, 12:15, 15:14, 26:12, 35:16, 36:24, 38:10, 38:25, 39:3, 39:6, 39:12, 87:16, 88:18, 98:11, 98:12, 100:6, 105:7, 105:11, 107:25 drawings [3] - 13:25, 112:17, 112:18 drawn [13] - 14:4, 14:6, 14:7, 29:21, 63:23, 70:15, 85:25, 89:3, 89:10, 89:16, 89:19, 96:7 dreadfully [1] - 60:14 drew [9] - 15:23, 17:8, 22:24, 23:13, 26:16, 38:7, 40:25, 73:15, 105:13 **DUFFY** [1] - 2:5 duly [3] - 7:4, 114:4, 114:13 duplicative [1] -109:12 during [15] - 22:15, 30:21, 30:23, 31:22, 33:17, 39:22, 39:24, 50:2, 73:14, 80:21, 89:21, 89:25, 90:4,

Ε

duties [1] - 10:18

106:12, 109:5

e-mail [31] - 8:24, 9:16, 11:14, 11:17, 57:2, 92:7, 92:16, 92:23, 93:2, 93:7, 93:15, 93:20, 94:5, 94:8, 95:11, 95:15, 95:20, 96:23, 99:4, 101:17, 101:24, 102:2, 102:3, 102:19, 103:4, 103:9, 103:14, 104:20, 105:4, 105:15, 105:24 e-mailed [1] - 29:2 e-mails [15] - 3:17, 10:3, 11:10, 12:4, 12:6, 26:11, 28:16, 28:19, 28:23, 42:2, 50:19, 51:16, 51:21, 91:5, 111:21 **EARLE** [26] - 4:22, 4:23, 6:14, 13:9, 13:11, 13:15, 13:22, 29:25, 37:20, 45:4, 46:8, 46:12, 46:17, 46:25, 47:5, 47:15, 47:18, 48:13, 49:18, 56:2, 56:6, 57:1, 91:14, 91:19, 91:25, 92:4 Earle [4] - 6:14, 6:15, 110:20, 112:23 early [6] - 10:9, 12:3, 16:23, 81:11, 81:19, 87:13 East [4] - 4:12, 4:20, 6:4, 114:10 **EASTERN** [1] - 1:1 Eastern [2] - 4:7, 5:24 easy [1] - 94:24 **Eau** [1] - 66:13 **ECKSTEIN** [1] - 1:5 economics [1] -19:19 educate [1] - 34:20 effect [3] - 63:24, 65:4, 109:5 effective [1] - 68:2 effort [3] - 82:16, 82:20, 92:25 either [6] - 32:15, 39:15, 65:15, 72:7, 77:19, 80:20 elected [3] - 66:6, 67:12, 67:14 **election** [2] - 66:7, 66:9

114:25 employees [4] -9:18, 19:4, 19:6, 19:7 employment [3] -17:19, 20:25 end [3] - 65:5, 94:7, 101:9 engaging [1] - 53:2 entire [2] - 63:1, 97:15 entirely [3] - 20:25, 69:1, 112:2 entirety [1] - 55:18 entities [3] - 9:3, 26:13, 26:19 ERICA [1] - 2:9 **Erik** [2] - 54:3, 54:5 estimate [1] - 39:21 et [6] - 4:3, 4:5, 4:21, 4:25, 5:21, 5:23 EVANJELINA [1] evens [1] - 42:8 eventually [12] -13:5, 14:3, 16:7, 16:11, 21:18, 62:4, 84:3, 87:5, 101:5, 101:20, 107:10, 108:23 exact [9] - 16:9, 16:14, 17:6, 20:12, 23:16, 29:14, 41:17, 41:21, 104:12 exactly [14] - 10:22, 14:17, 22:22, 27:20, 35:6, 35:14, 39:25, 43:24, 57:25, 83:11, 87:19, 92:13, 99:15, 106:7 Examination [2] -3:4, 3:5 examination [1] -114:17 **EXAMINATION** [2] -7:7, 57:13 examined [1] -114:16 example [1] - 93:25 **Excel** [1] - 82:9 Excel-type [1] - 82:9 excellent [1] - 57:3 exclusively [1] -20:20 excuse [2] - 12:20, 13:9 **emphasis** [1] - 70:12 exhibit [7] - 8:11, 47:20, 47:22, 47:23, 54:21, 57:10, 108:6 Exhibit [21] - 5:13,

employee [2] - 18:1,

8:6, 8:11, 8:15, 8:18, 9:9, 50:16, 56:14, 57:7, 57:16, 60:3, 73:8, 74:1, 74:22, 76:1, 76:21, 78:22, 85:20, 86:10, 90:22, 91:4 **exhibits** [3] - 3:20, 54:22, 56:20 exist [1] - 21:15 existed [1] - 24:23 expense [1] - 66:17 **experience** [1] - 80:4 expert [3] - 30:19, 54:15, 55:15 experts [5] - 10:15, 23:6, 54:5, 110:6 expires [1] - 115:9 explain [3] - 14:22, 23:11, 38:1 explanation [1] -7:20 **Exports** [1] - 109:8 extent [1] - 15:14 **eye** [1] - 15:13 F fact [4] - 47:21, 63:23, 64:8, 80:2 factors [1] - 71:5 fair [3] - 67:24, 92:22, 100:8

fairness [2] - 70:10, 70:21 falls [1] - 45:5 familiar [2] - 14:21, 14:23 familiarize [1] -22:16 familiarizing [1] -73:23 far [4] - 28:7, 34:10, 67:20, 98:4 fare [1] - 35:13 February [1] - 115:5 federal [1] - 23:19 felt [1] - 35:9 few [10] - 7:12, 9:22, 39:20, 50:13, 50:15, 63:15, 77:1, 80:20, 105:18, 112:25 field [2] - 78:7, 78:10 figure [1] - 42:10 figures [1] - 55:11 **File** [2] - 1:12, 93:12 file [15] - 59:13, 61:23, 61:24, 62:5, 62:11, 78:7, 78:12,

ELVIRA [1] - 1:4

employed [5] -

114:22, 115:1

18:22, 23:20, 31:17,

78:14, 78:15, 78:19, 93:13, 93:16, 109:21, 110:19, 111:23 filed [2] - 3:24, 14:24 files [20] - 9:1, 12:15, 12:17, 22:1, 26:11, 28:2, 37:1, 55:7, 62:14, 62:15, 62:21, 62:24, 63:23, 96:14, 108:10, 108:24, 109:15, 110:18, 111:10 final [2] - 15:21, 111:6 financially [1] -115:1 **finished** [1] - 72:15 firm [2] - 9:17, 107:6 firms [1] - 23:20 first [23] - 6:10, 7:4, 7:13, 16:7, 19:25, 21:18, 23:13, 47:7, 50:18, 63:11, 73:22, 74:3, 74:16, 74:19, 75:5, 78:21, 89:25, 90:4, 90:13, 91:12, 102:18, 108:19, 112:10 five [3] - 57:5, 104:13, 104:15 floor [1] - 68:5 focused [1] - 97:18 fold [1] - 86:11 folder [24] - 59:21, 59:22, 60:7, 61:16, 61:19, 62:10, 108:21, 108:23, 109:3, 109:4, 109:8, 109:11, 109:12. 109:13. 109:25, 110:3, 110:5, 110:13, 110:16, 110:22, 111:5, 111:7, 111:17, 111:20 folders [1] - 111:2 **folks** [1] - 72:5 follow [3] - 49:1, 77:20, 80:24 **followed** [1] - 77:25 following [2] - 64:24, 114:12 follows [3] - 7:5, 75:4, 106:25 foremost [1] - 63:11 forenoon [2] - 4:15, 114:8 form [8] - 3:12, 12:17, 29:25, 37:20, 60:1, 66:23, 83:21, 96:3 formal [6] - 17:16,

17:17, 17:18, 51:10, 51:12, 73:12 formally [1] - 108:4 formed [2] - 18:14, 18:15 former [2] - 33:18, 42:23 Forward [6] - 18:13, 18:18, 19:4, 21:2, 21:5, 84:25 forward [6] - 30:17, 86:14, 93:6, 102:20, 103:8, 105:14 foundation [1] -47:10 **Four** [3] - 20:1, 21:9, 21:17 four [2] - 39:20, 39:23 Fox [4] - 61:24, 62:1, 62:15, 65:10 frame [6] - 25:5, 25:23, 32:3, 32:4, 96:5, 109:6 Fred [5] - 14:24, 26:14, 99:19, 104:25, 105:11 Fred's [2] - 99:5, 99:8 Fredonia [1] - 5:10 Friday [1] - 16:8 Friedl [1] - 104:21 friends [1] - 73:1 front [6] - 16:13, 16:19, 57:16, 61:20, 76:1, 91:3 Frontera [2] - 4:25, 112:21 FRONTERA [1] - 2:8 full [2] - 19:5, 21:1 full-time [2] - 19:5, 21:1 function [1] - 21:25 Funding [1] - 77:8 funding [2] - 77:9, 77:22 **funds** [1] - 77:12 future [3] - 65:3, 65:7, 79:9

G

gain [1] - 72:13 gathering [1] - 74:21 GB [1] - 100:11 general [12] - 6:20, 9:15, 11:13, 21:19, 28:18, 50:13, 53:24, 62:13, 73:5, 99:19,

108:9, 108:10 General [4] - 2:1, 2:16, 5:2, 6:18 generally [16] - 8:20, 9:6, 9:16, 11:16, 15:15, 15:20, 18:24, 21:24, 28:23, 33:5, 34:20, 40:23, 64:3, 96:12, 108:17, 108:20 generally-accepted [1] - 40:23 geography [2] -39:1, 111:3 **GERALD** [2] - 1:15, 2:14 GIS [1] - 37:7 given [16] - 7:9, 25:22, 30:22, 40:4, 57:21, 58:1, 67:2, 69:21, 80:14, 81:11, 98:5, 98:20, 99:1, 102:3, 105:10, 114:19 GK[1] - 110:5 **GLADYS** [1] - 1:6 glass [1] - 7:25 GLORIA [1] - 1:7 goal [2] - 41:18, 97:15

Godfrey [12] - 6:13, 9:17, 10:4, 10:8, 11:1, 11:4, 11:8, 12:3, 16:17, 17:3, 47:11, 49:4 **GODFREY** [1] - 4:19

Government [25] -1:13, 2:2, 2:12, 2:16, 4:4, 5:22, 6:19, 43:15, 43:22, 44:7, 44:9, 44:12, 44:19, 44:23, 45:8, 45:16, 45:22, 45:24, 46:4, 46:22, 47:13, 48:4, 48:12, 49:4, 49:8

governor [4] - 89:5, 89:13, 90:2, 90:15 governorship [1] -90:7

graduated [3] -19:15, 19:22, 19:23 **GRATZ** [5] - 1:19, 3:3, 4:1, 7:3, 114:12 **Gratz** [21] - 5:17, 7:1, 7:9, 8:2, 13:24, 45:3,

45:7, 45:20, 47:13, 48:3, 49:24, 57:15, 61:11, 73:9, 75:25, 90:20, 91:2, 91:3, 92:6, 113:10, 113:13

great [4] - 59:19, 91:11, 92:5, 108:14

Greater [1] - 92:11 greatest [1] - 64:20 Green [10] - 32:23, 33:25, 62:2, 66:12, 99:5, 99:8, 99:12, 99:20, 100:11, 101:10 ground [1] - 7:13 grounds [2] - 9:12, 9:13 Group [2] - 50:21, 50:24 group [8] - 36:13, 50:20, 50:21, 51:14, 51:23, 80:25, 87:3, 92:14 groups [4] - 19:12, 58:8, 58:13, 86:12 guess [13] - 9:21, 15:13, 39:15, 51:20, 67:8, 83:24, 84:23, 87:18, 96:12, 102:15, 102:17, 103:6, 104:16 guessing [1] -102:17 guidance [2] - 26:6, 79:24 Gussert [3] - 101:17, 101:23, 101:24

Н

half [8] - 19:6, 20:4,

21:6, 21:21, 25:25,

33:13, 33:14, 58:18

half-dozen [1] - 19:6

halfway [1] - 103:13

hand [1] - 115:4 handful [1] - 56:19 handout [1] - 53:9 Handrick [5] - 33:19, 69:22, 70:1, 70:7, 70:8 handwriting [4] -27:23, 27:24, 27:25, 112:20 handwritten [6] -9:22, 10:1, 27:18, 27:20, 111:24, 111:25 hard [1] - 39:24 head [3] - 34:2, 42:19, 96:16 heading [1] - 77:7 headings [1] - 93:21 hear [3] - 46:13, 56:2, 91:19 heard [2] - 56:6, 56:11

hearing [1] - 43:3 Heather [1] - 5:10 held [1] - 104:17 **hello** [1] - 43:4 help [3] - 38:22, 64:23, 65:2 **helped** [1] - 65:6 helpful [2] - 60:19, helping [1] - 22:11 hereby [1] - 114:6 hereto [1] - 115:1 hereunto [1] - 115:3 hesitancy [1] - 37:19 highlighted [4] -63:16, 63:20, 66:10, 66:16 himself [1] - 102:4 hire [3] - 107:8, 107:11, 107:12 hired [2] - 17:11, 72:1 hiring [2] - 81:5, 107:6 Hispanics [1] - 41:12 hit [1] - 75:15 hold [1] - 17:5 **holding** [1] - 9:12 hope [1] - 65:4 horizon [1] - 25:22 HOUGH [1] - 1:5 hour [2] - 33:12, 33:14 hourglass [1] - 60:16

GWENDOLYNNE [1]

- 1:10

hours [2] - 39:14, 39:25 house [1] - 51:1 houses [2] - 23:3, 77:14 **huge** [1] - 34:4

I

idea [11] - 11:13, 69:12, 83:9, 86:24, 93:11, 99:19, 100:17, 103:2, 105:13, 106:5, 107:3 identification [3] -5:14, 57:8, 90:23 **Identified** [1] - 3:10 identified [2] - 41:7, 112:11 identify [4] - 45:23, 45:25, 86:5, 112:7 **III** [1] - 1:5 images [1] - 59:12 immediately [7] -16:6, 16:10, 19:23,

J

27:3, 39:17, 106:8 impact [5] - 64:5, 68:17, 68:20, 69:17, impacted [2] - 42:8, **impacts** [1] - 88:17 impediment [1] -28:13 implications [2] -64:16, 86:20 **implies** [1] - 101:1 important [2] - 87:3, 102:11 impossible [2] -71:17, 71:18 inadvertently [1] -13:11 **INC** [1] - 2:8 **Inc** [2] - 4:25, 18:16 include [3] - 11:17, 106:5, 107:7 included [5] - 59:11, 61:14, 82:6, 92:18, 105:8 includes [1] - 8:20 including [3] - 9:3, 19:5, 24:11 inclusive [1] - 11:16 incomplete [9] -14:6, 15:3, 15:12, 15:22, 16:4, 28:4, 28:5, 35:16, 94:19 incumbent [3] -22:12, 65:14, 109:22 incumbents [1] -65:12 indicated [9] - 11:10, 12:14, 13:25, 15:3, 24:18, 24:20, 25:9, 26:21, 82:9 indicates [1] - 54:24 indicating [1] - 47:12 individually [2] -56:24, 56:25 individuals [2] -104:5, 104:9 infer [1] - 15:10 informal [2] - 17:17, 17:22 information [20] -18:8, 23:6, 37:2, 42:20, 45:13, 48:5, 48:6, 48:10, 49:6, 49:7, 49:8, 74:3, 75:2, 81:23, 82:1, 82:14, 87:4, 98:23, 102:9, 103:19 infrequently [1] -44:1

input [4] - 80:16, 82:5, 82:7, 95:4 instance [2] - 5:20, 27:1 instead [1] - 86:17 instruct [1] - 44:16 instructed [1] -48:16 instructing [3] -45:11, 45:19, 48:23 instruction [1] - 26:7 intent [1] - 68:14 interaction [1] - 43:2 interest [5] - 19:12, 40:22, 58:12, 63:18, 73:18 interested [8] - 27:5, 58:8, 64:2, 64:3, 64:12, 64:15, 68:9, 115:2 interests [1] - 71:22 interject [2] - 9:25, interpretation [1] -47:1 intervenor [1] -54:10 Intervenor [2] - 1:11, 2:6 Intervenor-Defendants [1] - 2:6 Intervenor-Plaintiffs [1] - 1:11 introduce [2] - 6:10, 16:1 introduced [29] - 9:5, 10:14, 12:25, 13:1, 13:3, 13:5, 16:7, 16:14, 17:1, 17:4, 22:25, 26:22, 27:4, 27:10, 28:6, 29:16, 32:5, 39:19, 52:23, 53:25, 59:9, 81:22, 83:16, 83:19, 84:2, 98:5, 98:21, 110:19, 110:23 introducing [2] -

28:11, 28:14

52:6, 53:15

69:16, 104:3

introduction [2] -

invited [6] - 33:2,

invoice [1] - 54:22

involved [3] - 36:8,

33:4, 33:5, 69:14,

item [7] - 106:9, 106:13, 106:16, 106:23, 107:4, 107:5 items [6] - 8:21, 9:15, 80:9, 82:8, 109:24, 110:4 itself [2] - 90:9, 93:15 **JAMES** [1] - 2:4 Jamie [3] - 11:24, 93:3, 94:3 January [13] - 1:20, 4:14, 6:5, 18:15, 89:2, 89:22, 89:25, 90:11, 90:16, 105:15, 105:20, 106:1, 114:7 **JEANNE** [1] - 1:7 **Jefferson** [1] - 4:23 job [5] - 19:25, 20:5, 21:6, 26:4, 64:6 Joe [1] - 33:19 JOEL [5] - 1:19, 3:3, 4:1, 7:3, 114:12 Joel [5] - 5:17, 90:20, 91:2, 91:19, 113:13 **JOHNSON** [1] - 1:5 **JOSE** [1] - 2:9 JPS [1] - 2:12 JPS-DPW-RMD [1] -2:12 **JR** [2] - 2:4, 2:4 Judge [4] - 11:21, 92:20, 103:9, 104:21 judging [1] - 79:3 judgment [1] - 103:6 **JUDY** [1] - 1:7 July [5] - 16:12, 93:3, 95:11, 96:24, 101:17 jumping [1] - 26:10 **JUSTICE** [1] - 5:3

K

Kahn [12] - 6:13, 9:17, 10:4, 10:8, 11:1, 11:4, 11:8, 12:3, 16:17, 17:3, 47:11, 49:4 keep [4] - 87:12, 87:23, 102:19, 102:23 keeps [1] - 44:9 Kelly [7] - 3:5, 6:22, 50:14, 55:25, 56:12, 56:18, 57:14

KAHN [1] - 4:19

KELLY [19] - 5:5, 6:22, 45:2, 56:19, 56:25, 57:3, 57:9, 60:19, 60:22, 60:25, 75:17, 83:23, 91:17, 91:22, 92:2, 92:5, 96:22, 105:19, 113:7 **Ken** [3] - 110:13, 110:20, 110:21 **KENNEDY** [2] - 2:1, Kenosha [5] - 62:21, 63:22, 70:14, 71:7, 71:10 **kept** [2] - 25:1, 25:3 Kessler [12] - 14:5, 14:11, 14:24, 26:14, 28:3, 28:5, 82:20, 82:22, 82:25, 83:4, 83:10, 84:9 Kessler's [5] - 85:19, 99:11, 99:16, 109:18, 111:5 **KEVIN** [2] - 2:1, 2:15 key [1] - 75:15 kids [1] - 92:1 KIND [1] - 1:10 kind [26] - 19:2, 22:13, 25:3, 38:19, 47:6, 51:2, 51:9, 51:11, 52:22, 52:24, 53:2, 53:8, 53:9, 58:4, 58:19, 63:19, 65:18, 73:6, 73:22, 79:2, 81:17, 82:1, 96:11, 100:15, 100:22, 108:8 **kinds** [1] - 51:4 knowing [3] - 16:18, 67:8, 102:15 knowledge [2] -107:16, 114:14 **KRESBACH** [1] - 1:6 Kuhn [3] - 11:24, 93:3, 94:3

L

LA[1] - 2:8 labor [1] - 103:21 **Lane** [1] - 5:10 **LANGE** [1] - 1:6 Lanier [2] - 93:7, 93:10 large [3] - 63:24, 102:16, 111:11 last [17] - 8:10, 21:5, 25:24, 31:14, 46:13, 54:20, 74:17, 75:3, 86:6, 86:8, 88:19,

88:21, 88:24, 90:6, 102:18, 106:3, 106:24 lastly [1] - 25:24 **Latino** [2] - 110:15 **Law** [7] - 4:11, 4:19, 4:23, 5:6, 6:15, 110:5, 114:9 law [6] - 6:2, 9:17, 23:20, 86:16, 98:11, 99:2 LAW [1] - 4:23 lawful [1] - 4:2 lawmakers [1] - 67:5 laws [1] - 105:10 lawyer [2] - 107:9, 107:13 laying [1] - 77:17 Lazar [4] - 3:4, 3:25, 6:18, 7:8 **LAZAR** [29] - 5:2, 6:17, 13:10, 13:13, 13:20, 13:23, 34:18, 45:1, 45:6, 45:15, 45:19, 46:10, 46:16, 46:19, 47:2, 47:9, 47:17, 47:22, 48:2, 48:22, 49:13, 49:24, 55:24, 56:4, 56:10, 56:18, 56:23, 57:4, 113:9 **Leader** [1] - 81:16 leaders [1] - 79:3 leadership [11] -18:3, 22:25, 33:3, 36:20, 38:13, 51:1,

52:10, 52:13, 81:12, 83:14, 84:14

Leadership [1] - 36:2 Leadership's [1] -36:5

leading [1] - 22:15 least [8] - 13:2, 27:8, 52:3, 62:8, 68:4, 78:20, 79:12, 100:18 leave [3] - 20:20, 66:7, 66:8 left [5] - 20:24, 25:9, 40:13, 94:20, 95:8 Legal [2] - 5:9, 6:7 legal [5] - 24:12,

53:2, 77:12, 105:6, 105:9 legislation [6] - 13:3,

25:21, 51:7, 67:15, 76:6, 87:12 Legislative [1] -36:22

22:12, 25:19, 26:16, 38:12, 38:17, 40:2, 42:1, 50:25, 51:2, 52:13, 66:22, 67:1, 67:6, 67:9, 67:25, 68:2, 76:12, 79:3, 79:9, 85:25, 86:15, 86:18, 87:16, 87:21, 88:6, 88:14 legislators [19] -31:24, 58:7, 58:12, 67:20, 68:21, 79:12, 82:13, 83:13, 83:18, 83:22, 83:25, 84:11, 84:12, 85:5, 85:10, 85:14, 85:18, 95:5, 109:22 legislature [48] - 9:1, 9:6, 10:14, 11:3, 11:11, 12:8, 12:18, 12:25, 16:1, 17:13, 17:15, 17:19, 23:21, 23:25, 31:18, 39:19, 51:12, 62:9, 64:24, 65:3, 65:7, 65:24, 68:10, 68:15, 77:4, 77:11, 79:13, 80:4, 80:18, 81:3, 81:9, 81:14, 81:22, 84:7, 84:19, 88:5, 89:4, 89:13, 89:20, 89:21, 90:6, 90:11, 90:12, 92:20, 98:7, 105:6, 107:13, 109:10 legislature's [2] -12:22, 35:18 Legislature's [1] -24:9 legislatures [2] -27:2, 31:19 Legislatures [1] -75:13 **LESLIE** [1] - 1:5 less [3] - 41:18, 41:19, 72:7 letter [12] - 10:17, 10:23, 17:6, 44:22, 46:14, 46:18, 46:22, 47:1, 47:10, 47:25, 48:1, 104:24 **letters** [1] - 46:3 level [1] - 15:17 life [1] - 73:5 likely [3] - 72:7, 75:11, 77:16 limited [1] - 32:18 **limiting** [1] - 30:13 line [1] - 34:24 lines [1] - 106:3

list [4] - 9:15, 62:10,

62:11, 73:7 listed [4] - 8:21, 54:23, 79:4, 80:14 listing [1] - 19:24 lists [3] - 19:1, 22:12 litigation [9] - 11:8, 23:4, 23:7, 23:18, 23:22, 44:15, 44:25, 50:1, 73:18 LLC [2] - 4:23, 18:17 load [1] - 83:7 loaded [1] - 56:15 lobby [3] - 64:19, 64:25 lobbyist [5] - 26:8, 58:15, 58:16, 58:21, 58:22 Lobbyists [12] -32:22, 59:6, 59:15, 61:13, 63:7, 64:1, 67:4, 68:9, 68:13, 68:25, 69:15, 71:24 lobbyists [12] -34:10, 34:21, 58:11, 58:14, 59:11, 63:13, 64:12, 64:14, 72:2, 72:8, 73:2, 103:22 located [3] - 35:23, 35:25, 110:1 location [1] - 39:10 locations [1] -109:21 locked [1] - 40:13 look [26] - 23:15, 28:1, 28:24, 42:6, 50:6, 50:17, 53:23, 57:15, 59:16, 75:4, 78:14, 78:15, 78:17, 78:22, 83:9, 83:10, 85:20, 86:4, 88:19, 91:12, 97:2, 99:5, 99:23, 99:25, 105:24, 108:13 looked [12] - 15:16, 33:8, 34:21, 55:8, 64:4, 81:24, 83:1, 84:5, 96:10, 99:11, 101:8, 101:12 looking [15] - 11:12, 27:21, 59:7, 61:22, 71:13, 79:24, 83:12, 92:6, 93:15, 93:19, 93:20, 96:12, 96:23, 110:7 looks [6] - 14:16, 93:3, 103:11, 103:13,

109:18, 111:6

lose [1] - 94:25

lounge [1] - 34:7

LRB [2] - 108:22,

109:2 LTSB [2] - 37:4, 109:2 luck [1] - 61:2

М

machine [1] - 40:6 Madison [11] - 1:20, 4:12, 4:20, 5:3, 6:4, 19:15, 20:9, 93:7, 93:17, 93:23, 114:11 mail [31] - 8:24, 9:16, 11:14, 11:17, 57:2, 92:7, 92:16, 92:23, 93:2, 93:7, 93:15, 93:20, 94:5, 94:8, 95:11, 95:15, 95:20, 96:23, 99:4, 101:17, 101:24, 102:2, 102:3, 102:19, 103:4, 103:9, 103:14, 104:20, 105:4, 105:15, 105:24 mailed [1] - 29:2 mailing [1] - 19:1 mails [15] - 3:17, 10:3, 11:10, 12:4, 12:6, 26:11, 28:16, 28:19, 28:23, 42:2, 50:19, 51:16, 51:21, 91:5, 111:21 main [5] - 21:24, 71:25, 83:16, 94:23, 95:6 Main [2] - 4:20, 5:3 majority [6] - 24:2, 26:16, 76:7, 76:8, 89:24, 98:20 makeup [3] - 68:9, 68:14, 68:18 manage [1] - 26:4 manager [1] - 21:19 managing [1] - 20:1 **MANZANET** [1] - 1:6 map [110] - 13:1, 13:2, 14:3, 14:4, 14:5, 14:6, 14:11, 14:13, 14:18, 14:19, 14:24, 15:1, 15:4, 15:12, 15:14, 15:22, 15:23, 16:1, 16:4, 16:6, 16:11, 17:8, 17:21, 23:13, 26:15, 27:10, 28:2, 28:3, 28:4, 28:5, 29:20, 29:21, 29:22, 30:4, 35:16, 38:25, 39:3, 39:4, 39:6, 39:12, 39:18, 40:2,

41:16, 42:21, 53:25, 55:7, 58:20, 59:12, 61:23, 61:24, 62:1, 62:17, 63:4, 65:10, 65:11, 66:5, 67:7, 68:5, 70:15, 70:16, 71:10, 74:11, 82:18, 82:21, 82:22, 82:24, 83:3, 83:9, 83:10, 83:12, 84:8, 84:9, 84:10, 84:12, 84:21, 84:23, 84:25, 85:3, 85:11, 85:15, 85:19, 88:6, 89:12, 94:20, 96:9, 96:10, 97:21, 97:22, 98:2, 98:9, 98:10, 98:15, 98:19, 98:24, 99:11, 99:16, 99:18, 99:25, 100:16, 100:20, 101:6, 101:8, 101:12, 111:1, 111:11 Maps [2] - 59:23, 111:8 maps [98] - 9:2, 9:3, 9:5, 10:16, 12:15, 12:24, 13:4, 13:25, 14:8, 22:24, 26:12, 26:15, 26:18, 26:22, 27:4, 27:5, 27:6, 27:7, 27:8, 27:9, 33:8, 35:10, 35:13, 36:24, 38:7, 38:10, 38:14, 38:20, 40:24, 43:6, 43:12, 53:15, 53:17, 53:18, 53:19, 53:21, 53:22, 53:23, 59:24, 60:4, 60:6, 60:7, 60:11, 61:14, 61:17, 63:1, 63:14, 63:17, 63:23, 64:4, 64:17, 65:9, 65:19, 65:25, 66:21, 68:15, 69:5, 69:6, 69:17, 70:11, 70:23, 71:2, 72:10, 73:15, 73:22, 82:17, 83:18, 83:19, 84:2, 84:5, 85:6, 85:8, 85:11, 85:17, 86:19, 87:16, 87:21, 88:14, 89:15, 93:17, 93:18, 94:8, 95:25, 96:7, 98:4, 98:12, 99:2, 105:1, 105:2, 105:7, 105:11, 105:13, 107:17, 107:25, 108:25, 109:4, 111:12 March [1] - 104:22 MARIA [1] - 5:2 Maria [4] - 3:25, 6:18, 13:9, 61:4

Mark [2] - 11:25, 12:1 mark [1] - 57:5 marked [12] - 5:13, 8:5, 8:18, 47:20, 50:16, 56:24, 57:7, 57:16, 61:16, 75:25, 90:22, 91:4 **marks** [1] - 90:25 material [3] - 73:25, 74:22, 75:8 materials [3] - 36:25, 69:23, 75:11 matter [2] - 5:20, matters [5] - 25:19, 37:7, 81:14, 107:11, 114:15 **MAXINE** [1] - 1:5 Mayer [5] - 110:13, 110:14, 111:12, 112:11, 112:24 Mayer's [2] - 112:6, 112:18 McGrorty [1] - 92:8 mean [13] - 10:25, 12:16, 26:13, 40:17, 44:21, 66:8, 74:15, 89:19, 90:10, 94:12, 96:4, 97:24, 107:19 means [3] - 21:14, 67:9, 95:1 meant [7] - 19:17, 26:14, 26:19, 34:23, 106:6, 106:7, 107:3 meet [2] - 54:13, 54:17 meeting [21] - 33:1, 33:9, 51:17, 52:3, 52:8, 52:19, 53:15, 58:16, 58:17, 58:21, 63:7, 69:15, 79:3, 79:5, 79:7, 79:12, 79:17, 79:18, 103:19, 103:25, 106:12 meetings [9] - 29:18, 29:19, 44:5, 49:12, 52:1, 81:1, 81:2, 104:4, 104:8 Members [5] - 1:13, 2:12, 4:4, 5:21, 6:18 members [17] -28:22, 29:9, 29:11, 31:25, 32:8, 32:11, 32:17, 33:2, 37:6, 76:13, 80:17, 81:8, 81:11, 82:10, 84:6, 84:18 Memo [3] - 3:14, 3:16, 78:20

40:4, 40:25, 41:9,

memo [13] - 76:3, 76:9, 76:16, 76:21, 77:7, 77:9, 78:5, 78:11, 81:21, 85:22, 88:11, 88:13, 89:14 memorandum [4] -78:2, 86:22, 87:5 memos [3] - 31:12, 31:20, 78:9 mentioned [26] -15:24, 24:4, 24:14, 25:24, 26:11, 27:18, 28:2, 29:6, 31:23, 38:12, 40:1, 40:16, 42:13, 53:4, 59:3, 61:13, 64:7, 69:3, 70:13, 73:25, 80:12, 85:2, 89:1, 89:13, 94:17, 97:20 mentions [2] - 51:16, 97:9 **met** [3] - 54:16, 54:18, 54:25 mic [2] - 91:15 Michael [1] - 107:7 MICHAEL [2] - 1:15, 2:14 Michelle [1] - 92:8 mid [2] - 37:14, 74:13 middle [1] - 105:25 Mifflin [3] - 4:12, 6:4, 114:10 might [8] - 58:8, 63:17, 65:24, 68:15, 72:24, 73:9, 94:3, 108:12 Mike [21] - 11:20, 11:21, 11:25, 33:20, 33:22, 38:14, 38:22, 38:24, 52:11, 79:6, 85:2, 85:4, 85:24, 88:25, 94:9, 94:18, 95:12, 95:15, 96:24, 107:20, 108:1 Miller [4] - 11:25, 12:1, 12:12, 28:17 Miller's [1] - 52:15 Milwaukee [9] - 4:24, 5:7, 41:2, 41:7, 62:18, 62:19, 105:8, 110:16, 111:13 mind [1] - 63:21 mine [3] - 70:9, 112:3, 112:16 minimize [1] - 40:19 minimized [1] -15:19 minimum [2] - 42:13, 99:25

Minnesota [1] - 20:6 Minority [1] - 81:16 minority [3] - 68:7, 77:3, 77:15 minutes [2] - 33:16, 34:4 Miscellaneous [1] -110:17 missed [2] - 23:11, 73:9 misstated [1] - 50:22 modified [1] - 86:6 moment [5] - 34:16, 59:18, 60:12, 73:8, 75:18 moments [1] -112:25 Monday [1] - 6:5 month [5] - 21:5, 25:24, 54:20, 90:4, 90:13 monthly [2] - 44:4, months [1] - 101:13 MOORE [2] - 1:6, 1:10 morning [3] - 7:9, 73:9, 91:7 most [10] - 63:11, 63:15, 63:22, 64:9, 64:12, 68:1, 75:11, 80:3, 109:9, 112:13 mostly [2] - 57:20, 110:4 motion [4] - 14:23, 106:5, 106:14, 106:20 motive [1] - 70:3 move [2] - 42:17, 91:18 Moved [1] - 100:8 moved [1] - 100:24 moving [2] - 98:4, 100:23 **MR** [42] - 6:14, 6:22, 13:9, 13:11, 13:15, 13:22, 29:25, 37:20, 45:2, 45:4, 46:8, 46:12, 46:17, 46:25, 47:5, 47:15, 47:18, 48:13, 49:18, 56:2, 56:6, 56:19, 56:25, 57:1, 57:3, 57:9, 60:19, 60:22, 60:25, 75:17, 83:23, 91:14, 91:17, 91:19, 91:22, 91:25, 92:2, 92:4,

92:5, 96:22, 105:19,

MS [63] - 6:12, 6:17,

9:24, 10:24, 11:6,

113:7

13:10, 13:13, 13:20, 13:23, 29:24, 34:15, 34:18, 40:11, 42:25, 44:14, 44:21, 45:1, 45:6, 45:13, 45:15, 45:18, 45:19, 45:21, 46:7, 46:10, 46:16, 46:19, 47:2, 47:9, 47:17, 47:22, 47:23, 48:2, 48:22, 48:25, 49:13, 49:24, 55:24, 56:4, 56:10, 56:18, 56:23, 57:4, 57:11, 60:8, 60:17, 60:20, 60:23, 61:4, 66:23, 67:18, 70:18, 70:25, 71:11, 83:21, 88:8, 90:8, 96:3, 96:20, 102:25, 105:17, 110:9, 113:9 municipal [1] - 15:19 municipalities [2] -53:11, 99:3 Museum [3] - 20:6, 20:7, 22:4 must [3] - 23:11, 78:7, 92:21

Ν

name [2] - 50:19,

named [3] - 62:18,

78:19, 114:12

50:23

names [1] - 92:19 National [7] - 24:8, 32:1, 32:9, 32:11, 32:14, 32:16, 75:13 nature [4] - 14:14, 15:9, 43:25, 73:3 NCSL [1] - 24:8 near [3] - 86:7, 91:15, 91:16 necessary [2] - 51:5, 80:10 need [10] - 7:24, 7:25, 40:14, 42:6, 45:2, 77:19, 79:22, 99:23, 99:25, 101:10 needed [5] - 23:5, 23:7, 100:10, 100:14, 101:2 needs [6] - 22:14, 23:22, 36:14, 100:9, 100:25, 104:25 network [1] - 72:4 never [8] - 30:21, 31:4, 37:23, 97:20, 97:23, 107:12,

107:24, 108:4 new [7] - 33:7, 34:21, 35:1, 35:9, 35:13, 42:5, 66:21 **next** [8] - 7:18, 21:20, 22:7, 25:9, 40:8, 95:1, 104:20, 106:25 NICHOL [2] - 1:15, 2:14 noise [1] - 60:15 nonpartisan [1] -86:15 nonprofit [1] - 58:7 Nordheim [5] - 54:3, 54:5, 54:9, 54:14, 55:3 Nordheim's [5] -54:22, 55:10, 55:15, 55:21, 112:12 North [2] - 4:23, 5:6 northern [1] - 97:10 **Nos** [2] - 5:13, 57:7 notarial [1] - 115:4 Notary [3] - 4:9, 114:4, 115:7 **note** [4] - 18:6, 88:13, 88:16, 92:15 noted [1] - 78:6 notes [8] - 9:22, 10:1, 27:18, 27:20, 77:2, 79:11, 111:24, 111:25 **nothing** [4] - 31:14, 60:22, 113:8, 114:14 **notice** [7] - 3:11, 4:8, 5:19, 8:3, 8:8, 70:4, 114:6 noticed [1] - 50:19 November [9] -44:11, 44:20, 45:9, 46:5, 46:23, 47:3, 47:14, 48:5, 50:11 number [25] - 20:17, 20:22, 21:16, 25:1, 29:14, 41:14, 41:17, 41:23, 42:3, 42:11,

0

numbers [3] - 41:21,

42:19, 52:20, 54:19,

57:21, 58:2, 63:25,

64:20, 70:15, 72:25,

102:4, 102:16,

108:22

55:8, 57:10

104:12, 108:20,

oath [2] - 7:5, 114:17

Obey [3] - 42:24, 43:7, 43:13 object [1] - 37:20 objected [1] - 47:24 objection [20] -10:24, 29:24, 29:25, 40:11, 42:25, 44:14, 45:4, 46:7, 47:4, 48:14, 66:23, 67:18, 70:18, 70:25, 71:11, 83:21, 88:8, 90:8, 96:3, 102:25 observation [1] -13:19 obtain [1] - 83:3 obviously [2] -36:25, 39:22 occasionally [1] -19:12 occasions [2] -54:19, 54:20 October [2] - 44:11, 44:20 **odds** [1] - 42:7 **OF** [6] - 1:1, 4:23, 5:3, 114:1, 114:2 offered [1] - 18:2 Office [2] - 6:15, 20:15 **OFFICE** [1] - 4:23 office [11] - 20:8, 20:14, 20:15, 20:16, 24:20, 25:1, 79:19, 81:16, 81:18, 83:6 offices [10] - 4:10, 6:2, 21:25, 22:2, 22:12, 35:18, 36:2, 38:13, 47:11, 114:8 official [3] - 1:14, 2:13, 6:21 officially [2] - 39:18, 107:1 often [2] - 66:16, 87:11 old [2] - 27:13, 42:5 OLGA [1] - 2:9 once [3] - 42:6, 67:14, 81:21 one [60] - 13:2, 15:10, 16:2, 18:19, 24:8, 25:2, 27:3, 29:21, 33:2, 35:24, 39:2, 39:11, 41:11, 41:13, 42:15, 42:17, 43:4, 50:4, 50:6, 52:3, 54:5, 54:22, 58:23, 58:24, 58:25, 59:1, 59:7, 59:8, 59:9,

59:10, 59:13, 62:15,

62:16, 63:5, 63:21,

52:10 **PETRI** [1] - 2:4 65:11, 65:15, 65:18, 21:16 111:14 68:22, 70:24, 71:16, party [3] - 68:22, phone [4] - 13:16, populus [2] - 63:12, P 71:19, 71:20, 75:4, 71:15, 77:14 49:17, 91:15, 91:18 64:9 75:5, 75:6, 80:3, party's [1] - 65:21 portion [3] - 56:9, physically [1] - 51:6 82:19, 86:12, 86:14, 71:10, 79:10 pass [1] - 56:20 pieces [2] - 39:1, **p.m** [1] - 113:14 95:1, 95:3, 97:3, 97:5, passed [13] - 10:14, portions [2] - 55:21, 78:25 Packet [1] - 3:17 98:3, 103:22, 104:15, 22:25, 23:13, 23:14, 58:10 pinpoint [1] - 16:21 page [26] - 8:10, 104:18 23:16, 23:17, 27:11, position [3] - 25:25, place [5] - 6:2, 16:5, 75:3, 75:4, 75:5, 79:2, One [1] - 4:20 60:11, 62:6, 62:9, 16:10, 79:5, 106:11 26:3, 70:22 88:20, 91:12, 92:7, ones [4] - 31:8, 41:3, 68:4, 73:16, 77:21 places [1] - 67:13 possible [2] - 42:9, 95:11, 95:13, 96:21, 69:6, 110:19 passing [1] - 98:5 100:20 plaintiff [2] - 6:11, 97:1, 101:16, 103:8, ongoing [1] - 66:22 passkey [1] - 40:14 post [1] - 102:20 6:13 103:13, 104:20, open [3] - 61:24, past [4] - 17:13, posted [2] - 95:22, **Plaintiffs** [7] - 1:9, 105:14, 105:25, 65:11, 102:8 66:15, 77:10, 80:5 1:11, 2:10, 4:3, 4:4, 96:10 106:4, 106:25, opens [1] - 60:12 PAUL [1] - 2:4 potential [7] - 25:21, 4:21, 4:24 112:10, 112:13, operate [1] - 18:21 Paul [1] - 20:6 plaintiffs [2] - 6:16, 86:13, 87:12, 88:24, 112:14, 112:16, operations [1] pay [1] - 77:18 11:7 89:17, 89:18, 90:5 112:18 21:18 PowerPoint [11] -**PDF** [5] - 93:12, **Plan** [2] - 109:8, pages [7] - 75:9, opinion [8] - 18:22, 93:13, 93:16, 111:22, 3:13, 34:13, 34:16, 111:1 95:10, 96:18, 101:14, 70:19, 70:22, 71:1, 53:7, 57:18, 59:21, 111:23 plan [23] - 23:2, 23:3, 105:17, 105:19, 112:7 71:13, 72:2, 88:25, **PDFs**[1] - 27:12 23:16, 23:17, 77:20, 60:1, 69:8, 69:10, Pages [1] - 3:2 105:6 69:12 pending [2] - 4:5, 80:11, 83:16, 83:24, paid [4] - 17:11, opportunities [2] precede [1] - 12:4 94:11, 94:17, 97:16, 107:21, 107:23, 108:5 66:7, 66:9 people [22] - 8:25, 98:21, 109:9, 109:14, preparation [3] paired [4] - 27:2, opportunity [6] -11:11, 25:2, 32:17, 109:19, 109:24, 19:1, 54:14, 69:7 65:14, 68:21, 82:10 67:5, 67:12, 72:3, 33:25, 34:8, 34:9, 110:23, 110:24, preparatory [1] pairings [3] - 29:5, 72:12, 72:16, 107:8 110:25, 111:4, 111:5 51:3 38:12, 42:1, 42:8, 102:8, 109:23 opposed [3] - 87:22, 42:14, 42:17, 52:12, plans [10] - 81:22, prepare [7] - 76:9, pairs [1] - 102:14 88:7, 88:15 81:24, 84:1, 89:3, 79:8, 79:22, 79:25, 63:15, 63:25, 64:5, paragraph [4] **opposition** [1] - 50:4 70:15, 73:1, 84:13, 89:10, 90:10, 108:22, 81:2, 86:22, 86:24 88:19, 88:21, 90:6, options [1] - 77:23 86:16, 102:5, 102:16 109:13, 110:18, prepared [10] -102:19 order [1] - 57:5 110:22 27:16, 30:25, 37:3, percent [2] - 104:6, part [12] - 19:6, organizations [2] pleadings [1] - 14:21 112:10 62:5, 62:7, 74:9, 22:10, 33:12, 36:15, 74:16, 79:15, 83:24, 19:3, 58:4 **PEREZ** [1] - 2:9 point [15] - 7:24, 38:16, 58:10, 60:3, original [4] - 3:20, 20:5, 48:13, 48:20, 110:6 perfect [1] - 97:9 64:22, 69:21, 78:25, 3:24, 13:1 60:18, 77:8, 79:22, preparing [1] - 10:15 **perfectly** [1] - 91:20 81:19, 101:5 81:7, 83:5, 86:10, originally [1] present [10] - 5:9, perhaps [2] - 76:12, part-time [1] - 19:6 86:11, 97:18, 98:18, 31:23, 32:6, 32:25, 112:11 81:5 participant [1] - 52:9 others' [1] - 27:25 99:1, 105:12 37:14, 48:15, 63:6, period [2] - 20:19, participate [10] otherwise [4] points [2] - 3:15, 64:8, 72:12, 79:12 37:12 54:13, 66:21, 66:25, 79:7 14:16, 19:13, 29:3, periodic [1] - 49:11 presentation [36] -67:5, 67:8, 67:17, 71:15 policy [3] - 24:20, 32:21, 33:15, 33:21, permitted [1] -67:21, 67:24, 68:2, 25:2, 25:4 34:3, 34:12, 34:19, ought [2] - 36:14, 107:12 104:2 Policy [1] - 20:15 35:3, 53:6, 53:8, person [6] - 11:20, participated [2] -57:21, 57:23, 58:2, political [16] - 18:10, outcome [3] - 35:7, 11:22, 11:24, 12:1, 104:4, 104:8 58:5, 58:11, 58:19, 18:11, 18:19, 18:20, 58:20, 70:11 30:22, 114:12 particular [4] -18:23, 18:25, 19:2, 58:21, 59:3, 60:3, outlines [1] - 79:2 personal [4] - 70:19, 72:23, 76:19, 97:14, 60:7, 61:12, 61:15, 19:3, 19:8, 19:10, outside [8] - 45:5, 71:1, 71:13, 105:5 106:20 61:16, 64:22, 68:12, 38:5, 43:25, 64:6, 70:19, 85:19, 88:8, personally [1] particularly [2] -68:24, 69:3, 69:13, 64:15, 92:15 92:16, 107:18, 93:19 87:1, 105:8 69:21, 69:23, 70:4, 111:19, 111:21 **politics** [1] - 65:19 persons [1] - 12:10 parties [2] - 114:23, poll [1] - 92:24 70:12, 72:6, 72:10, overall [1] - 65:23 perspective [2] -115:1 72:15, 72:24, 74:4 polling [1] - 18:20 oversee [1] - 26:4 34:22, 97:25 partisan [9] - 65:24, Presentation [2] populated [1] - 64:13 Overview [1] - 3:13 **PETER** [2] - 4:22, 68:9, 68:14, 68:18, 59:23, 111:8 overview [3] - 52:25, population [15] -4:23 70:24, 71:2, 71:4, presentations [4] -15:17, 27:6, 27:7, 63:14, 64:21 **Peter** [11] - 3:14, 71:8, 71:9 58:1, 70:1, 71:23, 27:12, 29:4, 40:19, own [5] - 18:13, 6:14, 6:15, 13:21, parts [2] - 63:12, 74:25 77:20, 96:9, 97:25, 42:13, 64:8, 100:9, 46:11, 49:16, 76:4, 63:14 presented [6] -100:21, 100:24, 112:20 91:22, 92:3, 110:20, Party [3] - 52:1, 52:4, 33:17, 59:5, 59:14, 101:4, 110:7, 111:3, ownership [1] -112:23

39 of 43 shedse 2:11-cwww.FORT-PERECORDINAL 12 5N12 ORde 3608 33 903 92 ent 146 ge 10 to 10 of 14

67:3, 69:24, 70:8 presenting [1] - 70:6 presume [4] - 62:19, 67:16, 104:3, 104:6 presuming [1] -93:22 pretty [1] - 19:10 prevent [1] - 88:4 previous [3] - 59:1, 100:20, 107:25 previously [3] -11:22, 17:25, 36:11 primarily [2] - 20:18, 27:9 **principles** [1] - 75:7 printed [3] - 78:8, 86:3, 91:5 printout [1] - 57:18 printouts [2] - 50:18, 111:11 privilege [2] - 9:12, 10:3 privileged [1] - 48:6 procedure [1] - 53:6 procedures [1] -51:3 proceed [3] - 76:4, 77:2, 81:4 process [31] - 33:6, 35:6, 38:16, 42:4, 51:4, 51:9, 52:22, 52:25, 57:19, 58:9, 58:20, 59:2, 61:2, 66:22, 67:1, 67:6, 67:9, 67:25, 68:3, 69:10, 73:13, 79:1, 79:23, 80:1, 80:7, 80:19, 81:6, 88:12, 98:3, 99:1, 100:22 produce [4] - 8:14, 10:1, 55:7, 111:13 produced [5] - 9:11, 9:20, 10:2, 18:6, 56:14 product [1] - 15:21 Professional [4] -1:22, 4:9, 114:3, 115:8 professional [3] -18:9, 19:14, 19:15 professionals [1] -64:6 50:17, 59:25, 108:6 professor [2] - 54:5, 54:9 Professor [14] -54:14, 54:22, 55:3, 55:10, 55:15, 55:21, 110:14, 111:12, 112:5, 112:6, 112:11, 112:12, 112:18,

112:24 profit [1] - 48:20 progress [3] - 84:21, 84:24, 85:4 properly [1] - 105:9 proposal [1] - 14:2 proposals [1] - 10:13 propose [1] - 67:15 proposed [8] -27:13, 33:7, 43:6, 43:13, 93:21, 93:25, 96:7, 99:17 provide [13] - 10:12, 10:15, 18:23, 23:21, 26:6, 34:22, 38:18, 65:23, 69:20, 77:5, 79:24, 80:6, 82:1 provided [11] - 3:20, 11:9, 41:25, 42:9, 73:17, 75:1, 78:3, 91:6, 109:1, 110:21, 111:22 provides [2] - 98:11, providing [4] - 23:5, 23:6, 80:16, 103:18 public [6] - 17:12, 18:22, 51:8, 72:2, 73:20, 73:21 **Public** [3] - 4:9, 114:4, 115:7 published [3] - 31:8, 31:11, 31:15 purchase [5] - 36:8, 36:11, 36:16, 36:17, 44:2 purchased [1] -36:21 purchasing [2] -36:18, 36:23 purportedly [1] -14:24 purpose [13] - 29:18, 29:19, 34:19, 34:20, 64:22, 68:13, 76:15, 77:10, 83:12, 84:17, 84:20, 102:7, 102:17 pursuant [7] - 4:7, 5:19, 8:2, 8:14, 10:2, 46:3, 114:6 pursued [1] - 77:22 put [5] - 24:10, 37:5,

Q

qualified [1] - 114:5 questions [7] - 44:2, 49:15, 50:13, 50:15,

55:25, 56:1, 56:12 quickly [1] - 98:4 quite [4] - 73:20, 96:4, 96:22, 105:18

R

race [2] - 75:5, 105:9

races [1] - 26:6

Racine [5] - 62:21,

63:22, 70:14, 71:7, 71:10 **RAMIREZ** [1] - 2:9 **RAMIRO** [1] - 2:9 range [1] - 34:8 rather [1] - 87:17 read [7] - 50:6, 50:8, 50:9, 55:17, 106:9, 106:16, 106:17 reading [3] - 50:19, 93:20, 114:20 really [9] - 23:9, 36:17, 53:22, 73:4, 73:6, 100:1, 100:15, 109:16, 109:20 reason [9] - 71:8, 71:9, 91:7, 94:22, 94:23, 95:6, 97:14, 98:8, 98:10 reasonable [1] - 55:2 reasonably [1] -101:3 reasons [1] - 63:10 recalled [1] - 17:7 recalling [1] - 94:5 receive [1] - 43:6 received [2] - 75:12, 96:17 recent [2] - 59:10, 109:9 recess [5] - 49:21, 61:8, 75:22, 90:21, 113:4 recognize [3] - 8:6, 40:22, 112:5 recollection [7] -16:24, 26:25, 39:16, 50:12, 52:17, 55:1, 66:4 recommendations [1] - 51:11 record [19] - 5:17, 9:8, 49:16, 49:20, 49:23, 56:13, 61:5, 61:7, 61:10, 75:17, 75:21, 75:24, 90:18, 90:25, 113:1, 113:3, 113:6, 113:12, 114:19 Record [1] - 6:9

recruit [1] - 26:5 redistrict [2] - 34:25, redistricting [108] -8:22, 9:2, 10:13, 12:18, 18:1, 18:4, 20:18, 22:5, 22:16, 22:17, 22:18, 22:19, 22:23, 23:19, 24:5, 24:10, 24:12, 24:13, 24:14, 24:21, 25:6, 25:13, 25:18, 25:22, 30:16, 30:23, 31:7, 31:13, 32:2, 32:10, 32:19, 33:6, 33:12, 35:17, 36:12, 37:7, 37:24, 38:21, 40:16, 40:18, 40:23, 43:1, 43:7, 43:17, 43:18, 43:21, 51:3, 51:6, 51:9, 51:19, 51:24, 52:2, 52:4, 52:7, 52:21, 52:23, 55:6, 55:8, 57:19, 58:8, 59:2, 64:4, 64:16, 69:11, 73:11, 73:12, 73:13, 73:22, 73:24, 74:11, 74:25, 75:6, 75:7, 75:12, 76:5, 77:3, 77:13, 79:9, 79:23, 79:25, 80:5, 80:7, 80:11, 80:19, 80:25, 81:6, 81:14, 81:18, 82:6, 82:17, 86:12, 92:18, 92:25, 93:13, 94:23, 95:25, 96:9, 97:16, 98:2, 100:16, 100:20, 103:19, 104:10, 107:11, 107:15, 109:4, 110:3, 110:18 Redistricting [6] -3:13, 50:20, 50:23, 93:12, 110:5, 111:1 redistrictings [1] -77:11 reduced [1] - 114:17 refer [1] - 106:8 reference [2] - 86:15, 106:12 references [1] -94:17 referencing [2] -90:5, 107:9 referred [2] - 95:24, referring [2] - 84:25, 106:14 refers [1] - 92:23

records [1] - 34:11

refrain [1] - 13:16 refresh [2] - 55:1, 100:2 regard [3] - 8:17, 22:22, 30:16 regarded [1] - 29:6 regarding [21] -25:13, 25:21, 31:13, 32:1, 32:10, 32:19, 34:11, 35:12, 35:15, 43:1, 43:16, 43:18, 43:21, 44:13, 51:18, 51:24, 52:2, 52:4, 56:1, 56:12, 107:25 regards [6] - 8:21, 38:21, 76:5, 104:10, 107:15, 110:15 region [2] - 62:22, 62:25 regions [4] - 63:3, 63:5, 64:7, 69:17 Registered [4] -1:22, 4:8, 114:3, 115:8 registration [1] -44:3 regularly [1] - 44:3 **REID** [1] - 2:5 Reinhart [4] - 4:11, 6:3, 6:23, 114:9 **REINHART** [1] - 5:6 relate [2] - 18:24, 107:5 related [3] - 9:2, 9:22, 114:22 relates [2] - 93:22, 107:5 relating [3] - 22:18, 37:24, 111:13 relation [1] - 44:24 relationship [1] relative [1] - 114:25 release [1] - 89:2 relocate [1] - 65:17 remainder [1] - 79:1 **remapping** [1] - 97:6 remember [4] -20:12, 39:25, 72:18, 72:23 reminded [1] -104:25 removing [1] - 50:3 rephrase [2] - 30:4, 47:8 **Reply** [3] - 59:22, 108:20, 111:17 report [12] - 41:25, 54:15, 55:10, 55:15, 55:17, 55:22, 56:5,

49:25 56:9, 106:10, 106:17, 60:18 S 20:11, 20:21, 20:24, 106:23, 107:5 **Response** [1] - 3:12 22:7, 22:25, 23:1, **shot** [1] - 88:25 Reporter [4] - 1:22, response [3] - 9:9, 23:14, 23:15, 23:16, **shoulder** [1] - 108:13 S.C [4] - 4:11, 4:19, 4:9, 114:4, 115:8 9:13, 56:3 24:1, 24:23, 25:10, show [8] - 8:5, 8:17, 5:6, 114:9 62:17, 62:21, 62:24, reporter [4] - 6:8, responsive [3] -27:1, 27:5, 27:6, **sake** [1] - 13:16 6:25, 7:15, 50:5 71:14, 71:17, 73:15, 8:21, 10:1, 110:2 27:12, 84:20 **SANCHEZ** [1] - 1:7 73:16, 74:10, 83:8, **Reporting** [1] - 6:9 **showing** [2] - 64:20, rest [1] - 105:4 SANCHEZ-BELL [1] 83:14, 109:16 Reports [1] - 111:1 109:21 restate [1] - 32:3 - 1:7 **Senator** [6] - 11:25, reports [5] - 42:3, resulted [2] - 76:16, shown [2] - 47:20, sat [1] - 18:7 12:1, 12:12, 20:23, 109:20, 110:5, 76:20 59:24 saved [1] - 94:11 25:16, 28:17 110:22, 111:2 resurrect [1] - 75:18 **shows** [4] - 62:3, saving [2] - 95:1, senators [2] - 30:11, represent [2] - 91:4, retained [17] - 10:8, 65:11, 109:23, 110:14 95:7 30:15 93:18 10:9, 10:11, 10:12, side [1] - 108:6 saw [2] - 51:16, sending [1] - 102:2 representation [1] -11:7, 12:2, 16:16, significant [2] - 71:8, 55:20 sense [3] - 17:7, 47:16 16:22, 16:23, 17:3, scan [1] - 111:23 34:6. 65:23 Representative [17] -49:3, 49:9, 54:9, 72:8, significantly [1] -**SENSENBRENNER** 3:14, 11:23, 11:24, **scheduling** [1] - 29:1 77:4, 112:21, 112:23 63:22 **SCHLIEPP** [1] - 1:7 [1] - 2:4 12:11, 14:5, 33:18, retainer [3] - 10:17, **signing** [1] - 114:20 52:14, 52:15, 69:22, 10:22, 17:6 Science [3] - 20:6, sent [2] - 46:18, similar [2] - 22:10, 81:21, 82:20, 84:9, 20:7, 22:4 102:16 retention [5] - 12:4, 62:16 sentence [2] -85:19, 86:25, 99:11, scoot [1] - 108:12 27:12, 42:15, 82:10, simple [1] - 7:13 109:18, 111:5 scope [6] - 45:5, 102:18, 106:24 111:15 **situation** [1] - 47:7 45:6, 48:17, 48:19, series [1] - 94:7 retiring [1] - 91:24 representative [3] six [2] - 96:18, 11:21, 33:18, 76:3 88:9, 92:16 served [2] - 36:11, returned [1] - 20:8 101:13 Representatives [1] Scott [7] - 3:16, 79:13 review [3] - 8:11, skip [1] - 103:8 - 28:16 10:13, 16:14 11:17, 11:18, 85:22, service [2] - 17:12, slanted [1] - 70:23 representatives [8] -87:1, 105:16, 106:1 37:4 reviewed [3] - 15:2, slight [1] - 53:6 29:10, 30:7, 30:11, 96:6, 99:18 **screen** [1] - 61:20 **Service** [1] - 36:23 slow [2] - 60:14, 52:13, 64:18, 65:14, screwed [1] - 107:1 services [2] - 18:24, reviewing [3] - 41:8, 60:15 65:20, 109:24 77:5 seal [1] - 115:4 41:20, 109:24 small [7] - 18:21, represented [2] -Revised [1] - 111:6 **SEAN** [1] - 2:5 set [1] - 115:3 20:1, 21:13, 24:25, 63:15, 107:14 searched [1] - 92:19 setting [1] - 103:23 **RIBBLE** [1] - 2:5 34:5, 68:7, 101:3 representing [3] seated [1] - 5:17 several [6] - 12:15, Rich [4] - 11:21, social [1] - 73:3 23:24, 24:1, 71:16 seats [1] - 102:8 37:6, 59:4, 66:18, 92:20, 103:9, 104:21 soft [1] - 91:23 represents [2] -90:4, 90:13 second [5] - 8:10, **RICHARD** [2] - 1:6 soft-spoken [1] -47:21, 62:14 10:7, 57:6, 75:3, 75:6 **Shapefile** [1] - 111:6 rid [1] - 24:25 91:23 republican [2] **shapefile** [1] - 111:7 **RISSEEUW** [1] - 1:7 **section** [2] - 77:9, **software** [8] - 12:18, 71:19, 98:20 shapefiles [1] -79:9 **RMD** [1] - 2:12 22:17, 24:15, 35:17, republicans [5] see [27] - 23:15, 96:13 **ROBSON** [1] - 1:7 42:4, 55:6, 73:23, 26:16, 83:19, 89:24, **share** [6] - 83:5, 51:21, 55:14, 55:19, **ROCHELLE** [1] - 1:6 94:23 99:17, 107:6 59:18, 59:20, 61:1, 84:15, 87:4, 87:5, solely [1] - 32:18 **ROGERS** [1] - 1:7 request [5] - 55:7, 61:19, 69:16, 78:17, 102:9, 102:12 **RON**[1] - 1:4 solve [1] - 61:5 69:18, 76:15, 76:20, 87:22, 89:5, 91:17, **shared** [3] - 84:11, **RONALD** [2] - 1:3, **someone** [1] - 85:1 76:23 92:8, 93:8, 93:24, 84:12, 84:13 **sometime** [2] - 79:5, 94:4, 94:8, 95:17, requested [5] - 44:6, sharing [1] - 84:17 room [6] - 34:4, 34:5, 80:13 44:11, 79:17, 79:20, 97:11, 99:6, 100:12, **SHEILA** [1] - 1:4 36:1, 40:9, 48:16, sometimes [1] -92:17 101:18, 103:4, Sheridan [8] - 11:21, 83:8 41:15 Requests [1] -103:15, 103:16, 11:23, 12:11, 28:16, rooms [1] - 40:13 somewhat [1] -110:20 104:22 79:6, 80:14, 85:24, root [1] - 108:15 research [1] - 72:3 seeing [3] - 47:19, 108:1 somewhere [2] roughly [3] - 44:4, reserve [1] - 13:18 94:5, 108:17 Sheridan's [3] -62:1, 94:20 74:16, 104:15 reside [1] - 65:12 seem [2] - 55:2, 79:19, 81:15, 86:25 sorry [4] - 12:20, **RPR** [1] - 1:21 resided [1] - 40:5 77:15 **shifted** [1] - 81:15 46:8, 60:8, 84:11 Rule [4] - 45:5, 45:7, selected [2] - 63:5, **Resources** [1] - 77:8 shifting [1] - 42:14 sort [3] - 22:19, 29:5, 48:17, 48:19 64:7 resources [2] - 77:9, **shifts** [1] - 111:3 rules [1] - 7:13 52:15 selections [1] -77:13 **Shop** [8] - 37:9, sorts [1] - 51:7 run [2] - 28:25, 41:25 38:25 respect [2] - 49:5, 37:11, 37:24, 38:1, South [1] - 62:24 Russ [2] - 20:23, 70:23 Senate [30] - 14:15, 38:8, 38:15, 38:22, 25:16 speaker [2] - 79:6, 15:8, 15:10, 15:11, respond [1] - 51:21 39:9 RYAN [1] - 2:4 108:2 15:24, 17:2, 20:9, responding [1] short [2] - 49:14, Speaker [4] - 79:19,

80:14, 81:15, 85:24 speaking [1] - 69:5 **speaks** [1] - 90:9 specific [8] - 54:18, 63:3, 63:16, 68:20, 76:15, 76:23, 83:25 specifically [13] -24:10, 51:20, 51:25, 52:7, 72:22, 74:5, 75:10, 76:10, 76:25, 77:24, 78:4, 86:23, 99:9 **specifics** [1] - 72:18 speculate [1] - 37:22 speculated [1] -68:18 speculation [2] -67:19, 71:12 spent [2] - 19:25, 20:22 **split** [1] - 111:2 splits [1] - 15:19 spoken [1] - 91:23 spreadsheets [5] -27:1, 27:6, 27:11, 29:4, 29:6 **Spring** [2] - 32:23, 33:25 **square** [1] - 95:3 ss [1] - 114:1 St [1] - 20:6 staff [40] - 8:25, 10:4, 11:10, 11:20, 11:22, 11:24, 11:25, 12:8, 12:10, 15:24, 18:3, 25:1, 25:4, 28:19, 28:21, 28:22, 29:9, 29:11, 30:8, 32:17, 36:12, 37:6, 38:12, 38:17, 42:1, 51:2, 52:12, 52:14, 52:15, 76:12, 80:20, 80:25, 84:13, 84:18, 85:23, 86:12, 86:15, 87:1, 87:2, 108:2 **Staff** [1] - 50:23 **stages** [1] - 87:13 **stamped** [1] - 87:8 stands [1] - 63:21 Star [3] - 20:1, 21:9, 21:17 start [7] - 19:24, 32:13, 37:13, 98:8, 98:10, 108:15 started [3] - 21:9, 47:9, 105:11 **starting** [3] - 6:10, 8:1, 30:16 starts [3] - 79:1, 97:1, 105:25

state [9] - 14:18, 14:20, 15:6, 62:22, 63:2, 63:4, 63:12, 97:16, 97:17 **State** [25] - 4:10, 4:13, 5:25, 15:7, 15:8, 20:20, 20:23, 20:25, 23:1, 23:14, 23:17, 24:1, 24:9, 25:9, 26:5, 31:24, 36:22, 62:17, 73:16, 75:13, 76:8, 114:5, 114:11, 115:7 **STATE** [2] - 5:3, 114:1 state-wide [2] - 63:4, 97:16 **STATES** [1] - 1:1 States [2] - 4:6, 5:24 stats [1] - 55:9 **status** [1] - 101:8 stay [1] - 49:17 step [2] - 16:3, 46:20 still [11] - 13:13, 13:24, 18:5, 21:15, 24:15, 31:20, 45:11, 60:22, 66:21, 79:6, 101:2 store [1] - 21:13 straightened [3] -100:10, 100:14, 101:1 Strategies [6] -18:13, 18:18, 19:4, 21:2, 21:5, 84:25 **Street** [7] - 4:12, 4:20, 4:23, 5:3, 5:6, 6:4, 114:10 **strike** [3] - 29:10, 53:4. 112:8 **structure** [1] - 51:13 study [1] - 50:20 Study [1] - 50:20 subfolders [1] -108:20 subject [2] - 93:12, 97:5 submitted [2] -30:24, 55:19 subparts [1] - 60:11 subpoena [10] -3:11, 3:12, 4:7, 5:19, 8:3, 8:8, 9:9, 9:13, 110:2, 114:6 subsequent [4] -20:14, 73:14, 80:18,

104:19

41:18, 41:19

substantially [2] -

successful [3] -

26:7, 65:21, 66:18

suggest [1] - 49:17

suggesting [1] -70:10 suggests [1] - 67:23 Suite [6] - 4:12, 4:20, 4:23, 5:7, 5:10, 114:10 summaries [1] -111:14 summer [8] - 12:3, 16:24, 20:10, 30:17, 31:22, 32:5, 32:9, 49:3 summertime [1] -10:9 **support** [1] - 51:2 supposed [1] -107:23 surrounding [2] -62:2, 62:19 surveys [2] - 18:22, 72:2 **suspect** [1] - 25:20 swear [1] - 6:25 sworn [2] - 7:4, 114:13 synthesizing [1] -67:10

Т

tables [2] - 55:11,

82:9

talks [2] - 89:17, 102:7 **TAMMY** [1] - 1:10 tasks [1] - 22:5 Tate [1] - 52:11 Technology [1] -36:23 technology [7] -18:25, 22:14, 24:11, 37:4, 51:5, 73:24, 81:3 telephonically [1] -4:24 template [1] - 78:9 temporally [1] -30:14 tend [1] - 19:11 term [2] - 85:9, 87:10 terminal [2] - 35:24, 39:8 terminals [10] -35:20, 35:23, 36:6, 36:9, 36:14, 36:21, 37:9, 39:7, 40:10, terms [7] - 39:14,

30:19, 30:21, 31:4 testify [2] - 48:8, 114:13 testimony [2] - 45:3, 114:19 texts [1] - 31:6 **THE** [16] - 5:16, 6:24, 49:19, 49:22, 56:8, 56:17, 61:6, 61:9, 75:20, 75:23, 90:17, 90:24, 105:18, 113:2, 113:5, 113:11 themselves [4] -6:10, 77:12, 82:17, 107:14 thereupon [1] -114:16 third [1] - 101:16 **THOMAS** [5] - 1:15, 1:16, 2:4, 2:14, 2:15 thoughts [2] - 100:6, 103:2 three [4] - 15:9, 57:2, 74:17, 95:10 **THYSSEN** [1] - 1:8 TIGER [1] - 37:1 tilt [1] - 19:8 timeline [9] - 52:21, 53:6, 53:9, 53:13, 80:10, 88:2, 88:17, 89:9, 89:15 **TIMOTHY** [2] - 1:16, 2:15 title [1] - 110:12 today [2] - 16:25, 111:9 today's [2] - 78:8, 86:2 Todd [2] - 5:9, 6:6 together [7] - 6:21, 28:24, 29:9, 29:11, 30:7, 30:10, 30:14 took [8] - 16:10, 20:5, 20:19, 21:6, 49:25, 79:5, 91:10, 106:11 top [7] - 34:2, 42:19, 79:4, 79:10, 95:11, 96:16, 97:1 topic [5] - 52:18, 52:20, 70:6, 87:2, 87:15 topics [4] - 52:20, 72:20, 78:2, 79:2 toplines [1] - 92:23 touching [1] - 114:14 tracked [1] - 112:15

trade [1] - 66:16

89:17, 97:17, 100:25

testified [4] - 7:5,

trade-off [1] - 66:16 traditional [1] -40:18 transcript [2] - 3:20, transcription [1] -114:18 transition [1] - 25:3 TRAVIS [1] - 1:8 tremendously [4] -66:14, 68:6, 71:19, 71:20 trial [1] - 30:20 trials [1] - 31:4 trouble [3] - 60:24, 67:8, 67:10 true [2] - 90:3, 114:19 truth [2] - 114:13, 114:14 try [6] - 13:20, 26:5, 40:24, 67:2, 94:15, trying [4] - 16:21, 17:7, 99:4, 100:17 tunnel [1] - 91:21 turn [7] - 8:10, 75:3, 78:22, 85:20, 93:2, 94:7, 104:20 two [17] - 19:5, 20:4, 20:8, 21:21, 41:11, 58:3, 62:15, 62:20, 62:23, 71:14, 75:9, 78:25, 86:9, 86:11, 101:14, 106:3, 111:2 two-fold [1] - 86:11 type [3] - 33:9, 53:13, 82:9 types [2] - 53:12, 71:22 typewriting [1] -114:17 typically [2] - 46:2, 52:23

U

ugly [1] - 95:16 ultimately [4] -22:24, 22:25, 23:13, 27:11 unable [1] - 66:25 unassuming [1] -91:24 unclear [1] - 66:25 under [5] - 35:9, 35:13, 66:6, 66:20, 68:15 undergraduate [2] -

62:13, 70:9, 81:5,

1:1, 5:3, 114:1

19:16, 19:18 union [1] - 103:21 **UNITED** [1] - 1:1 United [2] - 4:6, 5:24 unless [2] - 49:15, 65:16 unlikely [1] - 104:14 unveiled [1] - 16:8 up [10] - 22:15, 24:23, 50:6, 55:11, 60:12, 75:16, 92:21, 96:8, 98:2, 103:23 **upcoming** [1] - 59:2 upper [1] - 101:16 utilize [1] - 55:6 utilized [1] - 110:21 **UW** [1] - 19:15

V

v3[1] - 94:11 v4 [1] - 94:11 valid [2] - 87:23, 88:1 Valley [4] - 61:24, 62:1, 62:15, 65:10 **VAN**[1] - 5:6 Van [4] - 4:11, 6:3, 6:23, 114:9 VARA [1] - 2:9 variety [4] - 18:19, 71:5, 109:14, 111:10 various [3] - 9:3, 38:21, 39:1 vary [1] - 100:21 **VERA**[1] - 1:4 verbal [1] - 82:3 versa [1] - 68:23 version [11] - 24:17, 58:1, 59:5, 74:19, 94:12, 94:14, 94:20, 95:1, 109:9, 109:19 versions [7] - 59:4, 94:15, 94:22, 95:5, 95:7, 98:15, 110:25 versus [4] - 5:21, 35:7, 41:4, 86:1 vice [1] - 68:22 Video [6] - 5:9, 5:18, 6:7, 20:1, 21:9, 21:17 **video** [3] - 5:18, 21:13, 113:12 **VIDEOGRAPHER** [13] - 5:16, 6:24, 49:19, 49:22, 61:6, 61:9, 75:20, 75:23, 90:17, 90:24, 113:2, 113:5, 113:11

videographer [1] -

6:7

VIDEOTAPE [2] -1:18, 4:1 viewpoint [1] - 70:9 Voces [4] - 4:25, 6:15, 110:13, 112:21 **VOCES** [1] - 2:8 **VOCKE** [2] - 1:16, 2:15 voter [3] - 19:1, 22:1, 44:2 voters [2] - 41:14, 100:19 voting [1] - 41:22

W

waived [1] - 114:20

waiving [1] - 110:11

WAL [4] - 59:23, 60:6, 61:16, 111:8 WARA [1] - 2:9 ward [3] - 86:18, 98:13, 99:2 wards [6] - 53:12, 86:1, 87:17, 87:22, 88:7, 88:15 warranted [1] - 103:4 water [1] - 7:25 Water [1] - 5:6 Waukesha [1] -62:18 Wausau [2] - 100:9, 100:25 website [1] - 95:23 week [1] - 33:10 weekend [6] - 16:5, 16:10, 39:17, 82:19, 94:19, 98:3 Wendy [2] - 6:12, 57:9 **WENDY** [1] - 4:19 West [1] - 5:3 western [1] - 97:10 Wheeler [4] - 106:10, 106:17, 106:23, 107:5 wherein [1] - 4:3 whereof [1] - 115:3 whichever [1] -50:24 White [10] - 38:14, 38:22, 85:2, 88:25, 94:9, 94:18, 95:12, 95:15, 96:24, 107:20 whole [3] - 33:11, 81:3, 94:25 WI [1] - 5:10 wide [2] - 63:4, 97:16 widely [1] - 102:21

WISCONSIN [3] -

Wisconsin [43] -1:13, 1:20, 2:1, 2:12, 2:16, 4:4, 4:7, 4:10, 4:13, 4:20, 4:24, 5:3, 5:7, 5:22, 5:25, 6:4, 6:19, 14:14, 28:6, 31:24, 32:22, 32:23, 52:2, 57:19, 57:20, 59:6, 59:14, 61:12, 63:6, 64:1, 64:5, 67:3, 68:8, 68:12, 68:24, 71:23, 92:11, 95:21, 97:10, 114:5, 114:11, 115:7 wish [1] - 106:18 wit [1] - 114:12 **WITNESS** [3] - 56:8, 56:17, 105:18 Witness [1] - 3:2 witness [6] - 4:2, 7:4, 48:8, 48:16, 114:19, 115:3 Wittenwire [1] -33:22 Wittenwyler [2] -33:20, 33:23 word [1] - 46:13 works [3] - 92:11, 92:20, 103:21 Wow [1] - 95:16 write [1] - 31:16 writes [1] - 106:4 writing [13] - 82:3, 89:12, 112:1, 112:2, 112:4, 112:5, 112:6, 112:10, 112:13, 112:15, 112:16, 112:17, 112:18 written [7] - 31:6, 31:11, 31:12, 70:17,

Y

82:5, 82:7, 86:5

wrote [4] - 76:3,

85:22, 88:11, 103:3

year [13] - 19:25, 20:2, 20:17, 36:13, 45:23, 58:18, 59:1, 64:24, 81:19, 107:25, 112:15 years [19] - 20:4, 20:8, 20:23, 21:16, 21:21, 31:14, 57:22, 58:3, 65:3, 65:8, 65:25, 66:22, 69:4, 69:9, 73:14, 74:2, 74:17, 75:1, 79:13

yourself [3] - 10:3, 15:4, 107:17

Ζ

zeroed [1] - 68:19